I.—PROBLEMS IN GREEK SYNTAX.

II.

THE ARTICLE.

In its day Middleton's book, 'The Doctrine of the Greek Article', was a wonder for its ample treatment of a minute subject and was playfully cited in somewhat the same tone as the mythical three volumes on *-di -do -dum*. But nowadays grammatical treatises of similar bulk weigh down the domain of language everywhere like the mortgage pillars, of which Solon tells us, and a whole volume would be needed for a mere digest of the 'literature' on the subject of the Greek article. And yet, as we have seen under the head of the articular proper noun,[1] the subject has not been exhausted, and even pressing practical problems have hardly been touched with the tips of the fingers. To be sure, every school grammar teaches the gradual evolution of the article from the demonstrative. Every beginner is warned to expect a different article in Homer from the article as it is found in Attic. Every novice knows the difference between the particular article and the generic. And yet the story is not always taught in the organic way, and the relation of the articular noun to the anarthrous noun is not always brought home to the feeling. With the genesis of the terminations of the noun this essay has nothing to do. To call -ς in ἵππο-ς pronominal may or may not be a rank heresy. This, however, is true: the article is the explicit expression of what lies implicit in the

---

[1] A. J. P. XXIII 9.

noun; ἵππος is not 'a horse' but 'the horse', and the particular
article reinforces whatever it is in the termination that fixes the float-
ing action or quality in an individual.[1] The particular article is
felt to be more and more a necessity, and not, as Julius Caesar
Scaliger called it, a *flabellum loquacissimae gentis*. But the
generic article, the article that picks out an individual and holds it
up as a model, a type, a standard, never becomes a necessity, and
the differences which the grammars make between abstracts with
and without the article not only lack practical warrant in the
every-day language, but fail to work in the field in which they
are most needed; and he who tries to distinguish between σοφία
and ἡ σοφία, ἀρετή and ἡ ἀρετή everywhere in Plato is not wise.
The differences that Plato himself makes, Plato himself unmakes.
How can we distinguish between οὐσία and ἡ οὐσία when the
introduction of an articular infinitive and an oblique case destroys
the possibility of distinction? You may say οὐσίας or τῆς οὐσίας,
you must say τοῦ εἶναι, you must say τοῦ μὴ εἶναι. Flat and
unscientific as it may seem, the addition and the omission of the
article are often due to rhythm. Flat and unscientific as it may
seem, the addition and the omission of the article are often
suggested by nothing more serious than the practical necessity
of distinguishing between predicate and subject,[2] or the artistic
need of amplitude on the one hand, of condensation on the other

The oldest use of the article anticipates the youngest, the
youngest use is rooted in the oldest, so that the article is alive
throughout the whole history of the language. It is the degree

---

[1] In 1893 I had rashly written 'the swift one', but I have learned to be
more cautious. In his recently published work, 'Lectures on the Study of
Language' (N. Y., 1902), Professor Oertel says (p. 306): ' To me it would seem
much more likely that a sound complex first attached itself to the compound
percept of an object, and that only later it came to signify also a prominent
element of this compound; so that the Indo-European word for "horse" did
not originally mean "swift" and was then used for the "horse", but that it
originally meant "horse", and the meaning "swift" was a later development,
the quality being expressed by the word for the object which possessed the
quality in a marked degree.' And in support of this view he cites a number
of authorities. The trouble is that 'horse' in compounds is used in so
many ways that the notion 'swift' does not come out inevitably. In popular
parlance it is said that a fence ought to be 'horse-high, bull-strong and pig-
tight'. Here reference is had to the horse's jumping power, and in most of
the compounds with 'horse' far other qualities are prominent than swiftness.
No more fascinating field than semantics, none more dangerous.

[2] Plato, Theaet. 188 B: ὡς ὁ Σωκράτης Θεαίτητος ἢ ὁ Θεαίτητος Σωκράτης.

of life, the manifestation of life, that interests the student of style; and nothing can bring this life more directly to the consciousness than the comparison of Latin, which has only what we have called the implicit article. It is this absence of the article that gives Latin its lapidary style. This lapidary style the Greek can take on, but it does not continue long in that stay. It is only a temporary pose. Homer is too rich and varied to dispense with the article which abounds in him as a demonstrative and prefigures largely its later use. It is in the higher lyric that the scarceness of the article makes itself felt; for we see that the resources of the later article are at hand and yet remain unused. Here and there the article has an un-Homeric extension, so that we note the conscious abstinence of art and pass almost with a feeling of relief from the rare atmosphere of higher lyric to the lower levels of dramatic dialogue and to the broad champaign of prose; and in certain moods we are ready to welcome the hearty multiplication of the article which is said to have characterized the Doric dialect.[1] We come down from Pindar's Olympian heights, from the lonely crag which the Theban eagle 'clasps with hookéd hands' to the meadows in which Aristophanes disports himself, and where the Laconian guests of Lysistrata (1247–1261) foot it so featly. There is no hyperaesthesis here. A little training, and the feeling is soon disciplined, and, once disciplined, becomes an unfailing source of pleasure—in the classic regions. Of course one must pay for it as soon as one comes into the vulgarities of the perpetually articular proper noun. But one accepts vulgarities in certain strata of language as in certain strata of society, with mild resignation.

Among the fellow demonstratives of the article, οὗτος, a manner of reduplicated article, is nearest of kin, and stands to the article as the article does to the termination, if, indeed, the termination is a demonstrative. ὁ, οὗτος and ὅς form a group most closely associated from the beginning of our record, and the familiar shift from one to the other gives an antique coloring to style. 'Them that', 'those that', 'those who', and the provincial 'them as' may serve as illustrations of similar feeling in English. Of this primitive state of things there are traces enough in the standard language; but while the grammars expand on ὁ μέν, ὁ δέ, on τὸ ὅ, τὰ ἅ, πρὸ τοῦ and the like, one of the most important

---

[1] Müller, Dor. II, 504, Blaydes on Ar. Lys., 1247. Read Alkman's Partheneion, and comp. A. J. P. XXI 352.

syntactical survivals of the whole group is not emphasized or
not emphasized in the right place, and that is the use of οὗτος
without a conjunction at the head of a sentence. This is not
asyndeton. οὗτος at the head of a sentence without a conjunction
is no more asyndetic than is the relative. οὗτος is the universal
demonstrative; the others are all particular; it is the regular
antecedent of the relative, and with it the relative is 'that'. With
the others, ὅδε and ἐκεῖνος, it is rather 'who' or 'which'. In
practical use, ὅδε sets up an opposition to οὗτος, gets to itself the
connotation of the important first person, but it is only in
dramatic style that ὅδε can make head against οὗτος; and it is the
large use of ὅδε that gives so much of the conversational tone to
the discourse of Herodotos. To be sure, ἐκεῖνος gives bulk, gives
weight, but it lacks precision. It is a 'yon', which is as vague
as the next world, to which it is always assigned, and great
hulking demonstrative as it is, it needs the guidance of ὅδε and
οὗτος. οὗτος ἐκεῖνος, ὅδ' ἐκεῖνος ἐγώ. All these are the commonplaces
of grammar. But, of late, scholars have thought it worth while
to watch the usage of so familiar a pronoun as οὗτος in the Attic
orators, and have formulated delicate regularities unformulated
before;[1] and a theory as to the composition of the work of
Thukydides has been based on the shifting position of ὅδε, on
ὁ πόλεμος ὅδε and ὅδε ὁ πόλεμος.[2] 'This' and 'that' in English are
not so simple as might be supposed. Foreigners do not always
master them perfectly; a German friend of mine always said
'one of those days', and the use of *este* and *ese* is said to be the
Spanish shibboleth. No one, however blunt his senses, is in-
different to the final ι in ὁδί and οὑτοσί, and it is not unprofitable
to train the perceptions to catch finer differences.

The Verb.

The domain of the voices is variously distributed in various
languages, as we have incidentally seen. Active, passive, re-
flexive are used in differing proportions. In
Voices. French and German the reflexive is much more
freely used than in English, which, in its turn, uses the passive
with an un-Germanic freedom suggestive of Biblical Latinity, as
Biblical Latinity is suggestive of Greek influences. Doubtless

[1] See Blass, Rh. Mus., Vol. XLIV, A. J. P. XI 107.
[2] See Herbst as summarized in A. J. P. I 241.

the predominance of one of these forms of expression over another would be a matter of stylistic interest, but so far, only a few sporadic observations have been made. A digest of the actual usage is still lacking and impressions are not to be trusted. How the elements of active, passive and middle may lie undifferentiated in the same form we can see by the verbal noun, we can see by the so-called active infinitive, we can see by the so-called passive participle in -τος.[1] ἄξιος θαυμάσαι is the more primitive form, and yields grudgingly to ἄξιος θαυμασθῆναι. The passive -τος sets up active and middle meanings. The finite verb is clearer but not overclear. Our record begins before the voices had clarified themselves, and in fact middle and passive continue throughout the language undifferentiated in the tenses of continuance and completion. It is only in the tense of attainment, where clearness seems to be absolutely necessary, that middle and passive go apart. Even there we find an occasional aorist middle that serves as a passive; and the so-called deponent passives, while ultimately explained as intransitive actives, remind one of the passives which the modern Greek uses as middles, nay, even as direct reflexives.[2] The -θησομαι future is late. It is an evolution that may be due to the desire of marking the ingressive, the complexive character of the future more distinctly,[3] and the emergence of the form is an interesting sign of grammatical consciousness such as we see in the persistent spread of such locutions as 'is being built' in English. All such new formations are in a large sense stylistic. We are no longer in an Homeric world, a Pindaric world; we are among the sophists, the sophists on the stage as well as the sophists in the forum. But for most of the phenomena of the voices mentioned in the grammars there is no history given, although there must be a history; there is no stylistic meaning given, though there must be a stylistic meaning. Instead of that we have much discourse about the distinction between transitive and intransitive, a distinction which, from a higher point of view, is futile. Call a verb that has a

---

[1] C. E. Bishop, Verbals in -τος in Sophokles, A. J. P. XIII 171-99; 329-42; 449-62.

[2] For example, ἐφονεύθη, 'he killed himself'. Vincent and Dixon (p. 315) cite ἐσκέφθη, 'he considered', ἐστοχάσθη, 'he perceived', ἐπλύθη, 'he washed', ἐνίφθη, 'he washed his hands', ἐκρεμάσθη, 'he hanged himself,' not only 'he was hanged'.

[3] See my Syntax, § 168.

passive a transitive verb, a verb that does not form a passive an intransitive verb.   That is well enough.   But this passing over to an object business is elusive.   Any verb may be transitive to the extent of taking an inner object.   Any verb may be intransitive when the object is involved, i. e., when it merely expresses an action.   'Thou shalt not kill' is intransitive.   It means 'thou shalt do no murder'.   So far theory.   But practice is another matter, and habits need watching in English and in Greek. "Only in America, I believe", says Mr. Fitzedward Hall in the Academy, March 25, 1893, "is the verb *empty*, except as meaning 'become empty', any longer intransitive: the humblest rustic in my parish would say, 'the Ore *empties itself* into the Alde.'" I must confess that as an American I am not ashamed of an obsolescence that I share with Sir Thomas Browne, and when Mr. Eugene Field tells us that the intransitive use of 'weary' is wrong,—well, most students of English would prefer the taste of Tennyson to the taste of the Chicago poet.   For all that, we should like to know which of the Greeks does these things, which of them uses the language to its legitimate or illegitimate stretch, whether those genial sinners, the poets, or the self-willed Thukydides with his αὐτόγνωτος ὀργά, or the *condottiere* Xenophon, πολυπλάνητος κάρτα (Hdt. 1, 56), like the Dorians whom he admired so much.   βάλλ' ἐς κόρακας has a common sound, but εἰσβάλλει is perfectly acceptable, as acceptable as 'empty' would have been to an American until Mr. Fitzedward Hall uttered his dreadful note of warning.

The moods are the keys of the music of language, and the Latin *modus*, however meant, is a happier name than the Greek

Moods.   ἔγκλισις.   Indeed, the moods of the Greek verb have a certain analogy with the moods in Greek music.   The direct and manly Dorian reminds one of the indicative, the martial Aeolian of the imperative, the longing Lydian yearns with the optative.   It is said of the Fourth Olympian of Pindar that the lively Aeolian mood is tempered by the plaintive Lydian.   If so, θεὸς εὔφρων εἴη λοιπαῖς εὐχαῖς would correspond to the plaintive Lydian strain, Οὐλυμπιονίκαν δέκευ Χαρίτων ἕκατι τόνδε κῶμον to the Aeolian element.   But if this especial illustration be fancy, as it is, the general analogy holds good; and like the moods in music, the moods of the verb represent the states of the soul, τὰς διαθέσεις τῆς ψυχῆς; and so the English 'mood' gains an additional fitness and is not to be discarded for 'mode', as the

manner of some is. Here, if anywhere else, sympathy is necessary to understanding, and yet we are not to leave everything
to sympathy; we are not to renounce definition, to renounce
analysis. The transfer of moods from one language to another
may be impossible, the transfer of feeling may be made, and
analysis may aid in the transfer. It will not do to say that this
or that turn makes no difference to us, that to us ὅπως and ὅπως ἄν
are all one.' Inasmuch as it must have made a difference to
them, we must learn to feel after the difference, if haply we may
find it. Orderly research has brought many apparent vagaries
of language under the dominion of law; and where analysis fails,
atmosphere helps. The construction is known by its fellows, by
the company it keeps, whether it haunts the courts or wrangles
in the mart or hides in the study. It is well to emphasize these
principles at this point, for the range of the moods differs so
much in different languages, there is so much overlapping, so
much crossing that, apart from certain rough and ready criteria,
the beginner is tempted to give up the whole domain to the sway
of chaos; but Chaos and Old Night are not our rulers and we
need not surrender everything to ἄλογος αἴσθησις. *Nil tam difficile
est quin quaerendo investigari possiet.*

In studying the elements of the problems of the moods, we
have to consider time as well as feeling. Moods are temporal,
tenses are modal. The attitude of mind is largely concerned with
that which is not yet, that which is no longer, with the future, with
the past. In fact, so much has mood to do with time, that future
relations are expressed modally. The Greek future is a mood, the
Latin future is a mood, the English future so far as it is differentiated from the present is distinctly modal, is imperative, is optative,
that is if 'shall' and 'will' are imperative and optative. The
sphere of present and past is occupied by the indicative. The
other moods divide out the future. Imperative, subjunctive, optative are all future. δός, δίδου, δῶ, διδῶ, δοίην, διδοίην, δώσω are all modal
and all future. But present indicative and imperfect indicative
may also reach forward, each into its future; the one into the future
of the present, the other into the future of the past. There is an
expression of will in the conative present, a sigh of failure in the
conative imperfect. The imperfect is a suspended future. It

---

[1] Madvig, § 122, Bei ὡς und ὅπως bewirkt ἄν keine bemerkbare Veränderung
der Bedeutung. So Goodwin, M. and T. § 44, 1, N. 2 (O. E.). But see A. J. P.
IV (1883), 422, and Goodwin, M. and T. (1889) R. E., § 312, p. 110.

can be interpreted into terms of ἔμελλον with the infinitive. It
needs no ἄν to mark its unreality. Now over this range of the
future, the future of the past and the future of the present, the
Greek moods undulate with their 'fluid footsteps', but they are
no more lawless than the tides. δώσει, δότω, δοίη, δοίη ἄν may be
used in the same general way, but what a difference of tone, what
a difference of sphere. The familiar future, the direct imperative,
the implication of order in wish, the courteous or ironical sug-
gestion, how these play up and down over the domain of will.[1]
Every novice feels or ought to feel the shifting tone, but the en-
joyment is enhanced if one watches the sphere, if one notices
that Hesiod who has so much to do with the imperative tempers
its austerity with the optative more frequently at least in proportion
than any other author, that Pindar shares in this respect what
may be called the Delphic sphere of Hesiod, that the Attics
abound in the imperative optative with ἄν, which shows all its
resources of bitterness in the tragic poets, all its resources of
fun in Aristophanes, all its resources of urbanity in Plato.[2] How
strange it seems when we pass from the optative and ἄν of Attic
society to the legal optative with κα in the dialect of Elis, and
find a hint turned into a law.[3] A syntactical journey is a journey
like any other from pine to palm, from snow to Sahara.

But it is only in the more elaborate and complex forms of the
sentence that the moods display all the subtlety of their usage as
it is only in the more elaborate and complex forms of social
life that the emotions require alembic and crucible. Outside the
compound sentence, subjunctive and optative have a short story.
But from the beginning of recorded Greek, we have to do with
complex sentences just as in the beginning of Greek history we
have to do with a complex society. Neither syntax nor society
is primitive in Homer. Even there we are under the dominion
of conventions. And so there are conventions in the use of the
moods that control the whole range of the language from the
beginning of our record. Not that these conventions are in-

[1] Mme. de Beaumont chez de Vogüé, Heures d'Histoire, p. 91: Le style de
M. de Chateaubriand me fait éprouver une espèce de frémissement d'amour;
il joue du clavecin sur toutes mes fibres.

[2] On the imperative optative with ἄν see now my S. C. G. § 394. A fine ex-
ample of bitterness is So. El. 1491 where Orestes says to Aigisthos χωροῖς ἄν
εἴσω.

[3] See Bergk, Gr. LG. I 110; Cauer[2] No. 259.

organic. They go back to primitive needs, no doubt, just as the two buttons on the back of the modern coat go back to the needs of the ancient swordbelt. They have their inner propriety, no doubt, and being subject to the shifting taste of the time, to the shifting taste of the individual, they serve to show us the form and pressure of the time and the character of the individual. But for all that they tend to mechanical uniformity of practice; they are fashions and like fashions exact a minimum of consciousness from ovine humanity.

To this sphere belong the sequences and it is here that we encounter the problem of the use of subjunctive and optative. From the beginning of our record the subjunctive and the optative have divided the dependent sentences between them. The subjunctive after principal tenses, the optative after historical tenses. That is a convention which may lose its hold but never loses its rights. Nothing could be more unhistorical than the statement that after historical tenses the optative is permissible only, not necessary (A. J. P. V 400). It is the unconventionality of the subjunctive after the historical tenses that gives it the charm of dramatic directness, of what is called *repraesentatio* (A. J. P. VIII 231). If we ask the question how it came about that the subjunctive has associated itself with the principal tenses and the optative with the historical tenses, we ask a question that is not easy of answer. Those who contend that the subjunctive is a mood of will, the optative the mood of wish, see in the will the stronger, more vivid form, that fits it for the practical prospective of the future of the present, whereas the wish seems to them weaker, less vivid than the will and hence better fitted for the future of the past, which is no longer a matter of practical consideration. But there are those who deny that the subjunctive is a mood of the will and the optative a mood of the wish. They are both futures, one more vivid, the other less vivid. But how do they come to be futures? Is not the Greek future indicative that we have modal? Are not 'shall' and 'will' modal? All that we know, all that it is safe to say is this, that a form which elsewhere conveys command associates itself with the principal tenses, that a form which elsewhere conveys a wish associates itself with the historical tenses and that this association, which is suggested by the similarity of the respective terminations, is found from the beginning to be a convention, a rule, a regular sequence. It is a sequence that is seldom violated in Homer,

never violated in Pindar, and unless we appreciate it as a sequence
we cannot appreciate the freedom that breaks up the sequence;
we cannot appreciate what the French call the inconsequences
of the coquette, Language. The audacious substitution at
pleasure of the subjunctive for the optative is a revolution like
that of the sophists, like that of the ἄνθρωπος μέτρον, like that of the
droits de l'homme. If we search the record we can see pre-
monitions of the deliverance just as we can see premonitions
of the French revolution; but epic conservatism like political
conservatism dies hard. Herodotos, the dramatic, Thukydides,
the sophistic lead the way in prose, but Xenophon is not carried
wholly away by the mob which he loathes. *Stare super antiquas
vias* is a motto which he would have understood. Plato keeps
nearer to the older tradition. The prose poet, the idealist, the re-
generator of the state, has his point of rest amid the tide of motion,
while the orators oscillate to and fro, balancing between νόμος
τύραννος and δῆμος τύραννος. But be it noted that the shift is from
optative sequence to subjunctive sequence, that it is all in one di-
rection. It is a revolution that does not go backward. Subjunctive
for optative almost, as it would seem, at the sweet will of the
speaker, but a shift the other way causes the grammarian to cry
out. Aristophanes makes it once or twice and it is resented as a
piece of *gaminerie* too outrageous even for that *gamin.*[1] It will
not work both ways. It is the subjunctive that encroaches on the
optative, not the optative on the subjunctive, just as it is μή that en-
croaches on οὐ, not οὐ on μή. Now this encroachment runs through
all the forms of the strictly dependent sentence, relative, temporal,
conditional, and belongs therefore to the universal aesthetics of the
language. In later Greek the vulgarization, if I may say so, is com-
plete. The optative becomes more and more an artificial form,
and its function is restricted to the primal wish. The communism
of the New Testament knows scarcely anything of the optative.
Form and thought are alike doomed. All the optatives we find in
later Greek are artificial and the frantic effort of the Greek Renas-
cence to keep the old language alive shows how great the dissi-
dence is between the spoken and the written word. The optative
is considered elegant—and they wear it in the wrong place. It
is a fine thing after a past tense. Why should it not be a fine thing
after a principal tense? And so they proceed to use it, and Lucian's

[1] See the commentators on Vesp. 110.

optative for subjunctive has been set down to vividness (see A. J. P. IV 428), whereas it is simply a bit of misapplied finery and reminds one of those who revive the English subjunctive and think that they are elegant when they use 'if I were' where 'if I was' is the only grammatical possibility.

The infinitive is not a mood, though it has been so accounted by ancient grammarians. A verbal noun, it has learned to represent all the moods, and, as the universal representative, has acquired modal rights. When we first become acquainted with it in Homer, it has learned to represent the indicative, and has taken on, though reluctantly, the negative οὐ. In obedience to the necessities of the indicative, it has developed a future, quite needless in its first estate. In fact, it has all the apparatus for *oratio obliqua* which the Greek handles so lightly, the Roman so heavily. But, as the dative of a verbal noun, its natural affinities are with the imperative, and this imperative infinitive has a vigorous life at the beginning of our record (see A. J. P. XIV 124). As prose advances, the imperative infinitive recedes until it finds one last refuge, the conservative pale of legal language. The infinitive of law and decree, of prescription, direction, recipe, the infinitive of Attic decrees and of Xenophon's Hunter's Own Book, is an independent infinitive. No leading verb is necessary. It is simply old-fashioned, like the long imperative in Latin, and suits old-fashioned things like laws, old-fashioned spheres like the sphere of venery. But as often happens, the dependent sentence retains the original life. The modal future survives in εἰ with the future indicative, in the relative with the future indicative; and the imperative infinitive, if banished from the society[1] of the leading clause, is fully alive in dependent discourse. In its dependency on verbs of will and endeavor the supplementary infinitive is still an imperative. It is the imperative of *oratio obliqua*, a fact not sufficiently emphasized in the ordinary grammars, and carries that imperative force even into the relative dependencies. Nay, when the nominal nature of the infinitive resumes its rights and the infinitive is forced back into the ranks of the noun by the article, it does not forget its imperative functions. περὶ τοῦ μὴ πιστεύειν = περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν πιστεύειν.[2]

Infinitive.

---

[1] On fashions in imperative expressions see Kurrelmeyer's interesting treatise, 'The Historical Development of the Types of the First Person Plural Imperative in German.' (J. H. U. Diss.) Strassburg, Trübner, 1900.

[2] Cf. Plato, Legg. 862 E: παράδειγμα τοῦ μὴ ἀδικεῖν = τοῦ μὴ δεῖν ἀδικεῖν.

Still the infinitive was doomed.   The final sentence encroached
more and more on its province, first pure finality, 'in order that',
then complementary finality, 'to'.   We see ἵνα, ὡς, ὅπως encroach-
ing on the territory that was all the infinitive's own.   Even in
Homer, even in conservative Pindar, we notice the beginnings of
an invasion that was to sweep the infinitive away.   ὅτι in Homer
was a prophecy of what was to come—of the vast inroads on the
territory of the *oratio obliqua* infinitive.   The seeds of death are
the same as the seeds of life.   The marvellously mobile noun-
verb perished from the face of the language.   The Centaur was
no more, and well might the modern Greek say : Ἤθελον Χείρωνά κε
Φιλυρίδαν ζώειν τὸν ἀποιχόμενον, φῆρ' ἀγρότερον, νοῦν ἔχοντ' ἀνδρῶν φίλον.
It is an enormous, an incalculable loss to any language and
changes its whole aspect.   It differentiates modern from ancient
Greek as much as anything else.   This is one of those mutilations
to which one may resign oneself; but one cannot kiss a wooden
hand though Goetz von Berlichingen may fight valiantly with an
iron one.

In my previous paper I had something to say about the parti-
ciple, which the ancients counted as a distinct part of speech, and
The Negatives. was betrayed into some discussion of the negative
μή with the participle.   After μή had found its way
into the logical conditional sentence and the scheme of the con-
ditional was thus completed,[1] μή became something more than the
negative of the will.   We may put ὁ μὴ συνιείς (Pind. N. 4, 31) back
into μὴ συνιέτω τις, but for all that ὁ μὴ συνιείς is a substantivizing of ὃς
μὴ συνιῇ of the old generic relative.   But while the participle may do
this, the adjective is not ready for it, certainly not the anarthrous
adjective, and those who would write μὴ φίλον Pind. P. 1, 51 are
sinning against the history of the language.   Once admitted to the
sphere of the participle, then to the sphere of the adjective, the
negative μή went forth conquering and to conquer.   It became the
dominant negative of the articular participle, of the articular ad-
jective, and finally usurped a wide domain in the later language.
But it is distinctly to be remembered that whenever in the Greek
of the good period difficulty arises with the negative, the true
appeal is not to the artificial generic but to the natural imperative.
Scratch the generic and you will find an imperative, as I have
shown.   But the shifting use of the negative with the participle

---

[1] Vierke ap. Monro, Homeric Grammar, § 359.

is only one illustration of the importance of the negative particles. For the Greek negatives are eminently things of moods, if not of fancies, if I may adapt Conington's translation of 'varium et mutabile semper'. The modality of οὐ and μή helps us to understand other modalities as well. If we can bridge the gap between the imperative μή and the ideal μή, we can bridge the gap between the imperative subjunctive and the futural subjunctive; and the use of οὐ with the optative and ἄν helps us to understand the optative as a dream that has found an issue, be it gate of ivory or gate of horn, into the realm of reality.

Of the proethnic history of the Greek negatives I have little or nothing to say, for in these papers I do not deal with origins. Not that I underrate the importance of origins. Given the origin, and the multiform manifestations of the one principle are much simplified. But language is an organic growth under conditions, under conventions. We ourselves are the children of conventions and a return to the primitive may shock us. So we feel a decided shock when οὐ is combined with an abstract noun, we feel no shock when it is used with an infinitive; and yet there must have been a time when οὐ διαλῦσαι would have been as repellent as οὐ διάλυσις.[1] A conventional remnant of this repugnance we have in the rule that tells us how the Greek of all periods prefers οὔ φημι to φημὶ οὐ, οὐκ οἶμαι to οἶμαι οὐ, just as the Roman prefers *nego* to *aio non*. But as οὐ is very common in *oratio obliqua*, the statement of the grammars has no organic meaning. Let a man, however, read attentively and he will see how seldom the hateful misalliance is suffered in Homer. To μή with the infinitive there is not the same repugnance, because the infinitive was used as an imperative before it was used as a representative of the indicative.

The study of origins, the study of comparative grammar, helps us somewhat, as I have said. It is well to know, for instance, that in all likelihood οὐ = *haud*, for this identification helps forward the theory of adhaerescence. But the main service of it lies in the check that it gives to the hasty parallelism of οὐ with *non* and of μή with *ne*, which like most parallelisms between Greek and Latin runs a very little way; and practically the two negatives in Latin are of not much more use to the student of Greek syntax than the two negatives in Hebrew,

---

[1] See now H. A. Hamilton, The Negative Compounds in Greek, p. 31.

an entirely alien tongue. In fact, it is better to dissociate these Greek negative moods, as they may be called, from the Latin phenomena, lest we get into the tangle that has immeshed the treatment of the positive moods.[1] It is better simply to face the fact that the Greek negatives present peculiar problems, problems that demand psychological sympathy as well as historical knowledge for their solution, and even then seem to baffle the most sympathetic and the most learned, so that eminent scholars are not ashamed to enter their *non liquet* against puzzle after puzzle. Of course, certain formulae are on everybody's tongue. οὐ is the negative of statement ; μή is the negative of will or wish. And there is another formula not so tangible. οὐ belongs to the world of actuality, μή to the world of ideality. But these two sets are not to be dissociated, as has been done, openly by some,[2] covertly by others. If we are to have any unity in the treatment, we must recognize the fact that the ideal comes not through vision but through will. 'Bring me up Samuel' is a command that precedes vision. The vision has to be conjured up, and it is a cardinal error to look for the genesis of the μή constructions elsewhere than in creative, or rather destructive, force. But the vision itself, as a vision, is actual, and all its negatives are οὐ.[3] How important this distinction is we can see by the negative of the future. Originally modal, the future leads us to expect the negative μή. And yet in the simple sentence it refuses to take the negative μή except in the question, where any indicative can take it. The future has become a real indicative, and it is only in the dependent sentence that it retains its modal meaning. There is practically no μή with the future indicative in an imperative sense.[4] We must use the aorist subjunctive. In the simple sentence, μή with the future indicative in an imperative

[1] On *neque* and *neve* see A. J. P. XVIII 123; Giles, Latin Negatives and their Use in Prohibitions, Proc. Cambridge Philol. Soc., 1901, pp. 12–3; W. K. Clement, A. J. P. XXII (1901), p. 90; Lattmann, cited by Golling, Z. ö. G 49, 275.

[2] See A. J. P. XII 520 (cited above, XXIII 13).

[3] The adhaerescent character of οὐ as contradistinguished from μή, stoutly denied by Aken, T. u. M. § 234 foll., seems destined to come to honor again. See Hamilton, l. c. As I hinted in the last number, I did not become acquainted with Aken's work until after the war between the States. If I had known his views earlier, I should have had to acknowledge as many obligations as there are coincidences in the results of our studies.

[4] See now S. C. G. § 270, or A. J. P. XV 117 foll.

sense has died without a sign. οὐ with the subjunctive, despite
its obvious advantages, despite the possibility of fine distinctions
between durative and complexive,[1] has given way to οὐ with the
future, to οὐκ ἄν with the optative. It is only in the dependent
sentence that the modal meaning reasserts itself. ἢν μή with
subjunctive cannot keep out εἰ μή with future indicative, as ὅταν
with subjunctive has kept out ὅτε with the future indicative;
and the final relative takes the old modal future indicative,
which has a variant in the optative with ἄν, and which may be
represented by the articular future participle, but not by the
subjunctive, natural as it seems to those who have been accus-
tomed to make a mechanical parallelism between Latin and
Greek subjunctive.[2] All this has become a habit, and when we
go back to the earlier world we take our latter-day phrasings
with us. When Homer's use differs from standard prose, we feel
the shock, but unless we are taught to observe we do not notice
the pudencies of Homer, we do not notice the absence of certain
familiar prose uses. We have to learn that there was a time
when μή with the participle was a novelty, as we have to learn
that at a late day μή with the participle is to be the rule. To us
μή is the natural negative of the subjunctive and the Homeric οὐ
with the subjunctive is a sport, so that we read with not a little
surprise in an Homeric scholiast that the natural negative of the
subjunctive is οὐ,[3] and we ask ourselves how such a notion could
have entered his foolish brain. Shall we revise our conception
of the subjunctive as an imperative? For imperative it is
throughout, except when the contrast between μή and οὐ is
brought out by the necessity of a double negative, as in μὴ οὐ.
μή is the regular negative of the optative of wish, but the potential
optative gives us pause; and see how in time the language
reconciles itself to οὐ with the optative as a representative of the

---

[1] See now S. C. G. § 386.

[2] How natural it is may be seen from Bäumlein's discussion in his Unter-
suchungen, p. 195. That the Latin relative in so-called final relations is at
all events originally potential is one of the points that emerge from the *tohu-
bohu* that is preceding the new creation of Latin syntax. This potential
(optative with ἄν) conception of the final relative in Latin is put forward in
my L. G. of 1872 (§ 632 Rem.), with due caution.

[3] λέγεται ὡς τῶν πέντε ἐγκλίσεων αἱ μὲν δύο ἤγουν ἡ ὁριστικὴ καὶ ὑποτακτικὴ ἔχουσι
φυσικὸν τὸ οὐ, αἱ δὲ τρεῖς ἤγουν ἡ προστακτικὴ καὶ εὐκτικὴ καὶ ἀπαρέμφατος τὸ μή.
Schol. L on O 41.

indicative. But that is essentially a post-Homeric construction and follows in the wake of *oratio obliqua.*   οὐ with the infinitive was at one time, as we have seen, an abomination.   The Greeks of a later period, the book Greeks, were puzzled by this. The only living optative to them, and a poor life it had, was the optative in wishes, μὴ γένοιτο and the like, and into their imitation of the standard language they slipped an occasional μή with *oratio obliqua* optative.[1] The negative of the imperative is μή. The mood is kingly and as a king it has long arms and rules large territories of dependencies, yet even there we find variations, even there a stubborn adversative participle refuses obedience, even there we have 'exceptions' that show how the primitive feeling breaks the bonds of conventionality. Nowhere do we feel a sharper thrill than when οὐ encroaches on the sphere of the imperative μή.   In post-Homeric Greek μή with the indicative in the dependent sentence is perfectly familiar to us; and we are ready enough with our μή in a generic sentence, μή in a conditional sense and the like, but to Homer, μή with the indicative was a liberty, a liberty due to passion, to hope and fear, to wish and will. The bounds of convention once broken, and Homer goes beyond the limits of classic syntax, and we find in him constructions that remind us of the period of decline, constructions that the scholiasts call by the hard name Alabandic (A. J. P. I 46).   At any rate, when these constructions occur in the best period, we are all on hand with our little emendations, we hustle the offending μή out of Antiphon with Jebb, we hustle it out of Theognis.   We prefer an unnatural stress in the one case, a false sphere in the other. We forget the possible intrusion of passion, a possibility that makes all impossibilities possible.

In all this matter of the negative, the sphere is of especial importance.   How small a part does the μή of apprehension play in pre-Platonic literature, that μή of apprehension, which, like the the Latin *vide ne*, amounts to a cautious assertion.   It is not foreign to Homer and yet Homer uses it in a way in which the fear, the apprehension is still felt.   In Plato it is little better than a formula, an Homeric construction rising like a lost river in Attic speech,[2] and in later Greek it is used mechanically. But the Platonic use, the later Greek use must not en-

[1] Justin Martyr, Apol. I 26, 21.
[2] See now S. C. G. § 385 or Weber, Entwickelungsgesch. der Absichtssätze, p. 192.

courage us to accept an explanation based on the practically positive character of the formula. οὐ μή cannot be treated as οὐ + positive.[1] The οὐ would necessarily rouse the negative element of μή into active life and, besides, the history of the independent μή itself should teach us caution.

If, however, the tentative μή with the subjunctive is old, as we have seen, οὐ μή may be as old. The age of the articular infinitive is not to be judged by its emergence in literature, nor the age of οὐ μή by its first appearance. Parmenides uses it, but he damns himself thereby as an epic poet as he damns himself by his μή with the participle and by the articular infinitive. Professor Lawton, who has no very good opinion of grammarians, says that Parmenides sags in his flight. The grammarian says that he has not the epic wing for the flight. As students of style we need not go into the origin of these things, we need not enter upon analyses at all. To us they are aesthetic elements and we say that οὐ μή is a stranger to the earlier literature, to the more aristocratic literature. It is absent from the epos and it is a sin to do what some critics have done and foist it on Pindar's sublimities. We can almost hear the poet saying with his wonted aloofness: ἀφίσταμαι. In an excited Paionian strain (O. 2, 6), he was guilty of a -τέον form, but only once, and in his hot youth he was guilty of a genial Doric articular proper noun (P. 10, 57), but only once. Guilty of οὐ μὴ διώξω (O. 3, 45), never. οὐ μή belongs to the dialogue of the wrangling mart; it belongs to the drama, by which, it would seem, so many vulgarities have found their way into classic society. Parmenides was so much in earnest that he forgot himself. That is all. History has no need of it and the orators use it sparingly. The elevation of the *bema* carried with it certain conventionalities which even common creatures like Aischines, if indeed Aischines was a common creature, had to respect. 'Keep your hand snugly within your *himation*,' said to himself the ex-actor of dignitaries.[2] 'Don't point. Don't fling about your articular proper nouns.[3] Don't make free with οὐ μή.' Why, even Demosthenes, who dared everything,

[1] See A. J. P. XVII 516.

[2] τὸ τὴν χεῖρα ἐνδον ἔχοντα λέγειν (cf. 1, 25) was a part of Aischines' stage σεμνότης. See his statue at Naples.

[3] A. J. P. XI 486. Franke's statistic seems to be shamefully inexact. Professor W. K. Clement wrote me at the time that he found 63 cases where Timarchos' name is mentioned, two of them with the article.

10

is shy of it, and his master Isaios uses it once only, and then in one of those dramatic bits that help to make us understand how he was the fountain of the power of Demosthenes.   Turn to the LXX, turn to the New Testament, and in half an hour you will gather up more οὐ μή's than are to be found in all classic literature. It has become the cheap emphasis of a showy race and a degenerate time (A. J. P. XVIII 460, 461).   In the same line of degeneracy is the frequent use of οὐ μήν ἀλλά in such writers as Polybios, in the same line the incessant νὴ Δία of later essayists, who swear where swearing is out of the question;[1] and it is only by contrast with their exaggerated uses that we learn to appreciate the exquisite reserve of the best period.

As to the other combination μὴ οὐ, that is perfectly legitimate after verbs of fear and apprehension, but it has little scope in Homer.   It is not overcommon anywhere.   It belongs so entirely to momentary needs, to dramatic pressure, that it does not readily pass over into the formulae of the *oratio obliqua*.   μὴ οὐ with optative expressing μὴ οὐ with subjunctive is suspicious.   Out of this μὴ οὐ with the subjunctive grow the other combinations μὴ οὐ with infinitive and participle, Attic constructions which seem to be possible only to the portentous mobility of both the thought and speech of that marvellous strain.   It is the Ionic blood that does it.   It is the Ionic spirit that does it.   And we are not surprised to find it in Herodotos.   Modern commentators get their brains muddled and their tongues twisted with μὴ οὐ.   It was a formula like *quin*, of which perhaps no Roman could have given a rational account; and it may be that the Attics were tangled in their own negatives, though one sooner distrusts one's own skill in unwinding the skein than that of the Attics in winding it.   Of course, μὴ οὐ became a formula, and was used in later Greek just as any other formula, but in the better times there is always something more than a formula.   It is never used except when a problem of practical interest arises, except when there is an οὐ of fact or statement to be met by a μή of will.[2]

The modal particles ἄν and κε(ν) figure largely in the study of the Greek moods, and as ἄν and κε(ν) were undoubtedly of
AN and KE(N). different origin, it might be possible to note stylistic differences in the varying use of these particles when they occur side by side as in Homer.   The inquiry

[1] Lucian, De conscribenda hist. II 19 R.: ὅτι γὰρ ἀληθῆ ἐστι κἂν ἐπωμοσάμην, εἰ ἀστεῖον ἦν ὅρκον ἐντιθέναι συγγράμματι.   [2] See A. J. P. VII 170.

is a legitimate inquiry, but so far no one has succeeded in differ-
entiating the two throughout to the satisfaction of the world.[1]
κε(ν), whatever its virtues, is obsolete, is dialectic. In the litera-
ture of the Attic time, it is as dead as ὄφρα. It belongs to the
unreturning past of the epos. It fades out before ἄν even there,
so that in looking over the whole range of Greek we can disregard
κε(ν) as dialectic and concentrate our attention on ἄν. Now if we
follow the history of ἄν we find a gradual growth of formulae that
remind us of the behavior of 'ever' and 'soever' in English, trans-
lations of ἄν which are something more than translations. In the
simple sentence there are particles to which ἄν nestles close, there
are sequences in which ἄν has its favorite position. οὐκ ἄν with
optative runs trippingly from the tongue. οὐ, optative with ἄν,
is a harder saying. It is hard to separate ἄν from the love of
the negative, not because the negative is negative but because
it is modal. No wonder that it prefers the negative to the
infinitive, when one remembers how shy ἄν was of the infinitive,
what a stretch it seemed to carry into *oratio obliqua* the finer
shades of *oratio recta.*[2] But it is in the compound sentence that
ἄν shows most clearly this gradual adhaerescence. First in the
temporal particles. ὅτ' ἄν becomes ὅταν, ἐπεὶ ἄν becomes ἐπήν,
ἐπάν. ἐπειδάν is born all at once. The original ὅτε with the sub-
junctive is after a while allowed no standing room. The temporal
particles of limit, 'while', 'until', resist the process longest. ἕως
and πρίν are found here and there without ἄν. Like ὄφρα, they
have rights of finality. 'Until' may carry with it purpose and
pure purpose will not have ἄν. But they too succumb to formula
and πρίν ἄν and ἕως ἄν alone are orthodox. The relative yields, as
the conditional yields, to the encroachment, and distinctions that
are still discernible in Homer are swept away in the democratiza-
tion of the language. We lift our eyebrows and sigh when we
find ἐάν with the indicative in later Greek. What else could one
expect of a generation of levellers? And then again the old
usages reappear in spheres from which they had almost formally
been excluded and shock the uniformitarian sense that we all
possess to a greater or less degree. So the omission of ἄν where
ἄν is expected always gives rise to feats of commentatorial agility,
and the problem is met in different ways. Sometimes it is set
down to the scribe and haplography lends its ready aid to restore

[1]A. J. P. III 446.   [2]See A J. P. XXIII 13.

the missing particle, though the restoration rends our ears by the reduplication of an unaesthetic sound—rends our ears and perhaps unnecessarily, ἀναναγκαίως, as we might say, as the Greeks would hardly have dared to say. Sometimes when the metre is recalcitrant or there is no reason to suspect the tradition, we see survival, we see a certain self-willed individuality. εἰ with subjunctive in tragedy, ὅς with subjunctive in tragedy—these are not alien to the epic note which we hear in tragedy, now in vocabulary, now in form. Surely ὅς with the subjunctive in tragedy is no worse than the occasional omission of an augment, and ὅς with subjunctive in Thukydides is more readily comprehensible than it would be in Isokrates, though hardly acceptable even in Thukydides.[1] Nor are all spheres of ἄν to be judged alike, as we have seen in the case of ἕως and πρίν, where the omission of ἄν may have offended the Attic ear as little as an occasional subjunctive would offend our own generation, which seems to be bent on the destruction of a mood that to most people is too vague to serve any useful purpose. And yet so subtle a thing is language that the revival of an old formula may be attended with a new meaning. When εἰ with subjunctive revisits the glimpses of the moon, it is not necessarily generic, as we find it in Homer and in Pindar, but it reminds us of the other use of εἰ with the subjunctive, the interrogative use, in which εἰ with subjunctive is = εἰ δεῖ + infinitive, so that εἰ with subjunctive is in tone very much like εἰ with future indicative.[2] Hardest of all to admit is the potential optative without ἄν. It has its rights in the older language, but when we leave Homer every example is suspicious. The imperative formula provides for most of the few instances, for in the imperative sense optative and optative with ἄν meet. Then, again, we say that the key of ἄν may dominate a long complex and if ἄν is found in the preceding sentence the situation is relieved. Euphony, as has already been hinted, may be at work. The repetition of syllables was an abomination to the Greek ear, and we, who take such liberties with the double sibilant in the possessive case, ought for justice' sake to be charitable to omission of ἄν in poetry or in carefully articulated prose. In Pindar's famous οὐ ξείναν ἱκοίμαν γαῖαν

---

[1] See the commentators on 4, 17, 2: οὐ μὲν βραχεῖς ἀρκῶσι μὴ πολλοῖς χρῆσθαι, which sounds like a proverb in ischiorrhogic metre.

[2] Transactions of Am. Phil. Ass., 1876, p. 8.

ἄλλων (P. 4, 118), there are -αν's enough and to spare. And yet there are unannealed optatives still left to torture the grammatical soul with 'remote deliberatives' and the like. By the student of aesthetics all these adherences to an obsolete type, all these departures from established formulae are to be regarded as so many notes of style; and our critical conclusions must be swayed in a large measure by the character of the author, the character of the department.

<div align="right">BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.</div>

II.—WORD-ACCENT IN EARLY LATIN VERSE.

SECOND PAPER.

IV.

There is one other syllable that needs to be especially mentioned—the short penult after the accent. This syllable shows the same definiteness and accuracy in the use which is made of its quantity in the verse, as the accented syllable. Being short, it is, of course, when used singly, restricted to the theses, but from a comparison of these it appears very clearly that the quantity of this syllable must have been more definite in the writer's mind than that of other unaccented syllables of the word. For instance, we find these penults in the senarii of the Trinummus distributed among the theses as follows:[1]

II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.
27	6	54	1	288

A comparison of these figures with those of the distribution of short accented syllables among the same theses of the same senarii shows plainly the similarity in character between the two syllables for the purposes of verse:

II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.
31	9	45	4	246

As will be seen, both kinds of syllables are found especially in those theses which in Greek were pure. More than anywhere else are they found in the last thesis, which in Latin also is invariably short. In fact, among the 553 endings of senarii in the Trinummus there are but 19 cases where the last thesis is not filled by one or the other of these two stable syllables. For comparison and contrast we may add a table showing the distribution of the short final syllables of words among the theses of the senarii in the Trinummus:

[1] This syllable can not, of course, occur in the first thesis of the senarius, except in the case of a resolution.

II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.
46	76	51	31	18

If, as we concluded in an earlier connection, the accented syllable is the centre of attention in the word, it will not appear strange that a syllable standing by its side, with a fixed relation to it and to the end of the word, and invariably of the same quantity, should have this quantity more clearly conceived and more consistently treated than is the case with other syllables of the word. It surely has a great advantage over the syllables before the accent, which stand in no such fixed relation to the beginning of the word and whose quantity is not always the same, and a still greater advantage over the final syllable, which is sometimes nearer and sometimes farther from the centre of attention, has no uniformity of quantity in the different words, and is, moreover, in most cases, subject, even in the same word, to the numerous modifications of conjugation or declension.

V.

With this knowledge of the characteristics common to the accented syllable and the post-accentual penult, we are able to explain several well-known peculiarities of early Latin iambic and trochaic verse in a more satisfactory manner than is generally done.

1. When an iambic or pyrrhic word stands at the end of an iambic or trochaic verse in early Latin, it is hardly ever preceded by another iambic word, or by a cretic word or one with a cretic ending, that is, the verse practically never ends with $|\smile - | \smile \smile|$ "malum dabunt," or with $- \smile - | \smile \smile$ "epistulam date." Almost equally rare are the corresponding endings with elision, like "malum accidit" and "epistulam abdidit." In the 553 iambic senarii of the Trinummus, for example, there are but four endings of the former class, in which a short accented syllable fills the fifth thesis, and there is but a single one of the latter class, in which a short postaccentual penult stands in that place. In the 617 iambic senarii of the Phormio there are two examples of the former kind and one of the latter.

Now, it is a fact that the fifth thesis of the iambic senarius (as well as the seventh of the iambic octonarius and the sixth of the trochaic septenarius) has fewer short syllables generally than any of the other theses. So in the 553 senarii of the Trinummus

only 58 of these theses are short, or less than 12 per cent of the total number (not counting resolutions).   In the 617 senarii of the Phormio there are but 57 short syllables in the fifth thesis, a trifle over 10 per cent of the single syllables in this position.

It is also true that the proportion of shorts in this position decreased as time went on, especially in tragedy.   In the 98 iambic senarii of Ennius there are 17; in the 265 of Accius there are but 15 short syllables in the fifth thesis.   In the 118 senarii of Cicero there is but one, and in all of Seneca's tragedies there are but very few.   In fact, the development went so far that the grammarians finally set it down as one of the rules of tragic verse, that the fifth thesis must always be long.[1]   But the movement is noticeable in the iambic senarii of other classes of literature also, though it seems to have progressed more gradually in these.   As against the 10 per cent and 12 per cent of short syllables found in the fifth thesis in Plautus, Terence and Afranius, the fragments of Novius have one short to 26 long syllables, the fragments of Laberius have four to 56, the first book of Phaedrus has 22 to 330.

Whatever may have caused this slight difference in development between the tragic senarii and the others, in the early time at any rate, the time with which we are concerned, this difference did not exist.   In the beginning, tragic and comic verse agree in having everywhere a smaller number of short syllables in the fifth thesis than in the other theses.   Both conditions however, the early state as well as the later development, merely show that there must have been a considerable tendency at work to reduce the number of short syllables, i. e. of syllables without prominence, and to increase the number of long, or prominent, syllables in this thesis.

If this was the case, the exclusion from the fifth thesis of both short accented syllables and of short syllables after the accent, while all other short syllables are quite freely admitted, can not be explained by the theory of accentual stress.   For if accent means stress, a short accented syllable will, of course, have more prominence for purposes of verse, than a short final syllable or a short syllable before the accent, and ought therefore to be found in this particular position with more frequency than these other short syllables.   But the opposite of this is true.   While among

[1] Diomedes, p. 507; Quintilian IX, 4, 111.

the long syllables found in this position, those with the accent are more numerous than the final syllables or the syllables before the accent, among the short syllables found in the same place there are hardly any with the accent, though the other syllables just mentioned, the final syllables and those before the accent, are well represented. The figures for the senarii of the Trinummus are:

	LONG.	SHORT.	½ SHORT.
Accented	173	4	2+
Before the accent	66	22	25
Final	135	31	19—

These peculiarities are, on the other hand, easily explained on the theory that the quantity of the accented syllable was more clearly defined in the mind of the writer than that of the other syllables mentioned. For if long syllables were preferred in the fifth thesis, the accented syllable of the word could be best relied on to furnish long syllables and to avoid short ones, while those other syllables whose quantity was less clearly defined in the mind, would just as naturally furnish a greater number of syllables whose quantity is, on closer observation, found in reality to be different from that which was preferred.

Short penults after the accent would, of course, be excluded from the fifth thesis as well as short accented syllables, because their quantity was, as we saw, recognized as short with the same clearness as that of accented syllables.

2. Another peculiarity of early Latin verse which is inadequately explained by the theory of accentual stress is that known as "iambic shortening"—when an iambic sequence of syllables is employed instead of a pyrrhic sequence as a substitute for a single syllable in either arsis or thesis.

The theory of stress-accent assumes that the "shortening" of the second of two syllables in such a sequence is brought about mainly by the stress of the accent on the first syllable or after the second syllable. But if the accent is sufficiently vigorous to accomplish this, it is rather strange that both pyrrhic sequences with the accent on the first of the two syllables, and iambic sequences with the accent thus placed are found without distinction in the arses and theses alike. Although the accent might appear in some parts of the verse, at first sight at least, to be a reinforcement of the ictus, and naturally to coincide with the same, it

surely does not, even at first sight, appear to play that part in the present instance, even though, according to those who believe in the stress-accent, this is one of the very places where the influence of this accent is most unmistakably shown.

If the accent adds so much to a short syllable by way of reinforcement of prominence, that this syllable is felt to be equal to a long syllable by its side which does not have the accent or, which amounts to the same thing, if the accent can centre enough effort upon its short syllable to neutralize the long quantity of the syllable by its side and make it seem no more prominent than the short syllable which has the accent, and if the accent can do this unaided by the ictus, then the accent itself clearly bestows as much upon its syllable in the way of prominence as unaided long quantity can do, and should, therefore, be recognized equally with length of quantity as a factor in the construction of the verse. But of course this is utterly out of harmony with the actual facts of early verse, as we found in an earlier connection, when we saw that the last thesis of the iambic senarius or octonarius, or of the trochaic septenarius, which never has a long syllable but is kept absolutely pure, has many more accented syllables in it than any of the other theses, in none of which are the circumstances so favorable or the efforts so great to maintain this purity.

Unless we are to assume, then, that the accented syllable always had a strong stress in some parts of the verse, and never had any appreciable stress at all in other parts, we are compelled to abandon the stress-accentual explanation of "iambic shortening" as inconsistent with the remaining facts of the verse. This means that we are reduced, in making a statement about the circumstances under which the second syllable of a resolution may be long instead of short, to saying that it is either before or after the ictus, which, strictly speaking, means nothing more than that when an iambic sequence takes the place of a pyrrhic sequence, it occurs either in the arsis or in the thesis.

But we can go farther than this. Whenever two short syllables occupy the place usually filled by a single syllable, it is the first of the two shorts which has the larger share of attention and which stands out most clearly in the mental image. This is sufficiently proved, first, by the fact that when two such short syllables stand in the arsis, the ictus falls upon the first of the two, and in the second place, and especially, by the fact that it is the second one of the two syllables, whose quantity is neglected.

This being the case, it is of course but natural that those syllables of the word, whose quantity is most clearly defined in the mental image, should regularly stand in the first of the two places.

We must, however, not forget that, though the character of the second of the two syllables is less distinct in consciousness than that of the first, the second was nevertheless invariably a short in the original, a fact which, as we saw in the case of the inner theses, which are pure in Greek iambic and trochaic verse, would in itself have a strong tendency to keep the quantity of this syllable in the Latin copy from being altogether neglected. While the first syllable of a resolution, with its unvarying brevity in Latin as well as in Greek, may well be compared with the last thesis of the iambic senarius or trochaic septenarius, the second of the two syllables of a resolution may be said in Latin to have been situated somewhat like the other theses that were pure in Greek but not altogether so in Latin—the second and fourth of the iambic senarius and the first, third and fifth of the trochaic septenarius.

Still the circumstances, even in the iambic and trochaic verses themselves, were by far more favorable to purity for the second syllable of the resolution than they were for the single syllables in the inner theses. The latter syllables had powerful odds to contend against in the fact that their fellows in the outer theses, even in the Greek models, nowhere suffered any restrictions as to quantity. The tendency would then naturally be, and actually was, toward perpetuation of the impure single theses, inner as well as outer, except in the case of the one at the end of the verses mentioned, which never was faulty either in Latin or in Greek. In addition to that, these already far from unfavorable circumstances of the second syllable of the resolution became positively favorable to its purity when, by the introduction of the hexameter with its much stricter adherence to Greek metrical rules, Ennius furnished not only an object-lesson, but also a critical standard for the construction of pyrrhic sequences.

Hence, while the faulty single syllables in the theses became permanent, so far as the republican drama was concerned, the faulty resolutions gradually grew less and less, and finally disappeared entirely. Cicero's iambic trimeters may be taken as a sort of land-mark. In the inner theses his verses are more like the loosely constructed lines of the Latin drama than they are like his Greek originals, but his resolutions are all strictly composed of two short syllables.

With these peculiarities of development in mind, we shall be better able to understand a few of the phenomena incident to it.

In the beginning, as we saw, the first syllable of a resolution stood on about the same level, as to quantity, with the last thesis of an iambic senarius or trochaic septenarius, i. e. its demand for a short syllable was absolute. The second part of the resolution was, to start with, situated very much as the rest of the inner theses were, i. e. it had a considerable preference for a short syllable, but frequently obtained a long one, especially when it was one of those syllables whose actual quantity was not so clearly defined in the mental image of the word. In the second part of the resolution, as well as in those inner theses occupied by a single syllable, actual investigation shows a much smaller proportion of metrical faults among the accented syllables than among the syllables in other parts of the word. A faulty post-accentual penult is of course, in the case of the resolution, impossible, since this penult always has the required short quantity.

The favorite syllables for the pyrrhic sequence are then, as we should expect, the accented syllable for the first with the post-accentual penult for the second of the two syllables.

If the first syllable of a resolution is accented and the second is a final, as will be the case in dissyllabic words, the chance for faults in the second syllable will be very great, since the final syllable of the word is naturally the least stable of all. But these faults were not easy to avoid, simply because the frequent use of pyrrhic words, and consequently of their iambic substitutes, could not be avoided without unnatural effort. In addition, there is the fact that in a number of much-used dissyllabic words—*ego, mihi, sibi, tibi, ibi, ubi* and many imperatives of the first, second and fourth conjugations—the final syllable, neither in early Latin nor later, even under favorable conditions, ever passed beyond the stage of wavering between long and short. We should not be surprised, therefore, when we find frequent faults of quantity in resolutions composed of dissyllabic words, even after such faults have practically disappeared in all other resolutions.

A resolution made up of the post-accentual penult and the final syllable of a word would be open to the same objections as the resolution just mentioned. We do not find this formation, even in the earliest time, in words which are composed of or which end in three short syllables, and which thus give an opportunity of correctly forming the resolution without using the final syllable

of the word at all. If, on the other hand, two short syllables at the end of a word are preceded by a long syllable in the same word, i. e. when the word is dactylic or ends in a dactyl, there is no such opportunity of escaping the unstable final syllable, and resolutions composed of the last two syllables of this class of words are found to some extent in Plautus and some others of the early dramatists.[1]

But the resolution last mentioned must have been felt to be inconvenient for the reason given, that it had the unstable final syllable in that place which was most liable to admit a false quantity, and for still another, which must have been quite as potent for prevention as that. In the form of resolution in question, the prominent place—in case of an arsis, the place under the ictus—is filled by the post-accentual penult. Now this is a syllable which in no other conceivable case could or did stand in a prominent position in the verse or under the ictus. In this respect, indeed, being invariably short, it differed from every other syllable of the word. The slighter the weight or quantity of the syllables customarily employed in a given place in the verse, the greater is the tendency to fill the place with the post-accentual penult. This syllable is nowhere found singly in the arses, and in the theses the senarii of the Trinummus, as already mentioned in another connection, show the following distribution:

II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.
27	6	54	1	288

That these various conditions, working together, should, by the time of Terence, have succeeded in making a resolution composed of the last two syllables of a dactylic word practically impossible, is surely quite natural. Besides, very good use could be made of such a word at the end of the verse, and also in the middle whenever the final syllable became long by position.[2]

---

[1] The comparatively small number of resolutions constructed in this way is due to the fact that, apart from the end of the iambic and trochaic verses, dactylic words and words with dactylic endings are of rare occurrence.

[2] The explanation usually offered of the peculiarities displayed by early Latin iambic and trochaic verse in the treatment of words composed of, or ending in, a tribrach or a dactyl, though plausible at first sight, is really open to insuperable objections. What can the theory of accentual stress do to explain the fact that Plautus never has the ictus on the second syllable of a tribrach word or ending, while he allows it on the second syllable of a dactylic

Such a manipulation as that just mentioned was, of course, not possible in any pyrrhic sequence of syllables that stood before the accent in a polysyllabic word. Resolutions of the latter kind are, therefore, necessarily found at all stages of the republican drama, and faulty iambic sequences are found occasionally used in this part of the word as long as they are found at all. Such resolutions do not, of course, play an important part, simply because the long words that make them possible are of comparatively infrequent occurrence in speech.

As to the cause of the faulty use of the iambic instead of the pyrrhic sequence, it simply remains in conclusion to state explicitly what has already been implied, namely that in the beginning the faulty use of a long syllable in a resolution was due to the same conditions as the faulty use of a long syllable anywhere in the verse, and that it was merely the result of the special circumstances which have been mentioned, that the faults in the former case disappeared earlier than they did in the latter.

TERRE HAUTE, IND.   J. J. SCHLICHER.

---

word? The latter case, where a long syllable with the accent is thrust into thesis, is surely more objectionable than the first case from the standpoint of the theory that the accent reinforced the quantity.

Moreover, the scarcity of words like "tempóra," with the ictus on the second syllable, turns from an argument for the accentual theory to an argument against it, when we consider that the occurrence of the same class of words with the ictus on the first syllable and with the last two syllables in thesis—a most perfect state of things according to the accentual theory—is even more rare.

III.—PIERRE D'URTE AND THE BASK LANGUAGE.[1]

THE TRANSLATOR.

Some account of Pierre d'Urte may be seen in La Revue de
Linguistique, Tome 30, p. 221. We there learn that he was alive
and, apparently, in London, in October 1719; was probably
identical with a person registered at St. Jean de Luz in 1669; and
also that he contributed to the collection of versions of the Lords
Prayer published by John Chamberlayne[2] at Amsterdam in 1715.
It is to Professors J. Vinson and J. Rhys that we owe the dis-
covery and collection of the few scraps of information about the
man that have been transmitted. It was the latter who reported
the existence of his manuscripts to Prince L. L. Bonaparte, from
whom their fame spread in Baskland. No mention of him has
been found in the archives of the French Protestants in Canter-
bury. It is likely, however, that, when the registers of burials in
England during the 18th century shall have been published, one
will find out where he lies buried. More may be said about his
name than about his life. It is composed seemingly of the French
'de' and 'Urte' the name of a Bask village, which is subject to in-
undations from the river Adour, the eastern boundary of Baskland,
and has almost lost its proper language in presence of Gascon
and French. This name is generally modernised into 'Ahurte',
either by the prefixing of French 'à' or by analogy from 'aurthen',
= 'horno, hoc anno'. Jean de Perochegi in his 'Origen de la
Nacion Vascongada y su Lengua' (53. c. in M. J. Vinsons very useful
Bibliography, Paris, 1891 and '98) thus defines the word, p. 8, "El
nombre de Hurte ò de Hurte-à, quiere decir 'Diluvio', y aora se

---

[1] Anecdota Oxoniensia. The Earliest Translation of the Old Testament
into the Basque Language (a fragment), by Pierre d'Urte of St. Jean de Luz,
circ. 1700. Edited from a MS in the Library of Shirburn Castle,* Oxfordshire,
by Llewelyn Thomas, M. A. (Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1894).

* As King Alfred the Great mentions the Wáscan it is interesting to know
that the liber de Hyda is kept there, not far from d'Urtes Vasconian books.

[2] The Rev. H. E. Salter, Vicar of Shirburn, by Watlington Railway Station
(G. W. R.), says that this gentleman did not belong to the family of the same
name whose epitaphs exist in Shirburn Church.

advierte que tambien significa 'año', y como el Diluvio universal durò un año, se saca la consecuencia de haver quedado synonomos ambos nombres y reducidos à una sola voz 'Hurte-à' que comprende 'año', y 'diluvio'." But Pouvreau in his precious, but never published, Dictionary of 1665, has 'dur' as a synonym of 'ur' meaning 'water' or 'river'. Sometimes, in Scottish English for instance, 'water' means 'river'. 'Dur', of course, is Keltic for water. The name of Durango in Biscaya, as Andres de Poça (Bilbao, 1597) records, has been thought to mean "the other side of the water." Now 'urte' is but the infinitive or verbal noun of 'ur'. It means 'watering', 'flowing', 'flooding', 'leaking', 'going out', 'running out', and these ideas describe a year no less than an 'inundation' or 'flood'. So the real, inner, original meaning of 'ur' ('water') is probably 'that which runs out and melts away'. It explains the Baskish word for 'blue', 'grey', namely 'urdiña', which signifies 'worthy of water', 'like water', 'water colour'. The second element in this comes, like 'dina' in old Portuguese, from the Latin 'digna'. It seems to give an etymon to some Latin and Greek words. In the Proverbs ('Refranes y Sentencias') printed in Pamplona in 1596, p. 48, 'hurte' translates 'salir' speaking of 'smoke issuing'; p. 49 it is used of 'a bear leaving' his cave; p. 33 of a 'birote', or 'arrow coming out' of its quiver. It also occurs there several times in the sense of 'año', 'year'. In Exodos 'urthuco' is the future participle of the radical meaning 'melt', 'become liquid'.

THE MERITS OF D'URTES VERSION.

The literary charm of d'Urtes style is considerable. His translation may safely be used as an easy book for beginners, being on the whole very carefully and grammatically written, and extremely faithful to the French. This, of course, is to be understood after making the corrections here below indicated, and already partly carried out in the 2nd edition of the Genesis. He may have used as its basis "La Sainte Bible. A Geneve, Pour la Compagnie des Libraires. M. D. CCV," which has the Press-Mark 3025 g. 10. B at the British Museum; or the edition of D. Martin, published at Amsterdam in 1707, which has the Shelf-Mark Bib. Fr. 1707. b. I, at the Bodleian Library, Oxford. He seems to have followed with slavish fidelity those peculiarities of J. Calvins text which are noticed by readers who are familiar with the English Authorised Version of 1611. His language is

still current in the northern part of French Baskland, the region called 'le Labourd', in Baskish 'Laphurdi', i. e. 'robbers (or ? 'pirates') horde', a name which recalls "the pirate coast," a part of the Arabian littoral of the Persian Gulf. But there is no writer living who handles it so well as he did. His book has provided some additions to the Word-books. It is linguistically superior to the translation of Captain Duvoisin (London, 1859). The Basks ought to be very grateful to the Earl of Macclesfield, to Mr. Llewelyn Thomas, (both now dead) and to the Delegates of the Clarendon Press, who arranged for its publication. The Rev. J. I. de Arana, the well-known Gipuskoan author and Jesuit Priest, who had been censor of Baskish books for the Bishop of Vitoria, and who died at Oña, Provincia de Burgos, at the end of 1896, wrote to me on receiving a copy of the Oxford edition: "Mr. Thomas a fait un grand bien à la littérature Basque en éditant l'écrit de St. Jean de Luz, circa 1700. Avec toutes ses imperfections et négligences, ce livre Euskarien montre un langage Basque si fluide et naturel, comme on parle encore dans les petits peuples' près de Sara et St. Jean de Luz. Après avoir lu quelques pages, notre Philologue et Bascophile de Navarre, le Père Julio Zejador, est de la même opinion." Don J. G. Oregi, a priest at St. Sebastián, formerly professor of Heuskarian in the Instituto de Gipuskoa wrote as follows: "Mucho me alegro de la publicacion del Genesis y Exodo de d'Urte." It was from him that I learned in 1887 that the d'Urte MSS existed. Yet at least one Bask priest, the Curé of Ahetze, burned the small edition of the Genesis! The defects of the translation suggest that the author was ignorant of natural history and weak at genealogies, that it was made in extreme old age, when he was already partly deaf and blind; that it was made under dictation, and written down from dictation, and never finally revised by d'Urte himself. As Roger Bieston says: "In Genesis written, the matier euident is". D'Urtes Baskish shews slight traces of the influence of the adjoining Gipuskoan dialect. His grammar bears the date 1712. It is the oldest surviving Baskish grammar written in the French language, but badly arranged. It was published in 1900, with many misprints, at Bagnères de Bigorre. Its editor knows very

---

[1] A Castilian idiom, 'pueblo', which in Baskish has acted in the opposite direction, giving to 'erri' = 'town', 'contry' the sense of 'people' or 'inhabitants of the town'.

11

little Baskish, and has never seen the original. In it d'Urte makes no allusion to his Biblical translation. This fact probably shews that this was made later. The translation escaped the notice of the compilers of "The Bible of Every Land" (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons), which has a preface dated 1860, the very year when the library at Shirburn Castle was catalogized.[1] D'Urtes version can hardly be considered a theological question, except as adding to our catalogs under the heading 'Genesis'. One might look for the controversial bearing of his rendering of Gen. c. 3, v. 15, where Calvin has: "Et je mettrai de l'inimitié entre toi et la femme, entre ta semence et la semence de la femme: cette 'semence' te brisera la tête, et tu lui briseras le talon ": d'Urte puts: " Eta eçarrico diat etssaitassuna hire eta Emaztearen artean, hire haciaren eta Emaztearen haciaren artean: haren haciac lehertuco daroc hiri burua eta hic lehertuco dioc hari thalogna." In this 'haren' means 'her'; 'haciac' is 'the seed' in the active case, and 'hari' translates 'lui', which grammatically may mean 'to him' or 'to her'. The context would make this pronoun refer here to 'the seed'. Duvoisin in this verse, of course, follows the Romish interpretation. Owing to the neutrality of Heuskarian pronouns, d'Urte is here as impartial as the original Hebrew. His translation is good seed for Papists and Protestants alike. I had to satisfy the Secretary of the Trinitarian Bible Society upon this head, before he would undertake the reprint of Etórkia.

NOTANDA.

1. VARIATIONS IN SPELLING. G. c. 14, v. 3 'Siddingo', but vv. 8 and 10 rightly 'Siddimgo'. G. c. 14, v. 11. 'Guci' and 'Guzti' are the same, and mean 'all'. G. c. 16, vv. 1 and 3. 'Eiiptuarra' is the equivalent of 'Ejipciarra'. D'Urte spelt 'Ejiptu' or 'Eiiptu' as a rule. But I think in one or two places he used the 'g'.

Harismendi p. 57, and Materre p. 333 and 359 put a 'g' into it. G. c. 17, summary, 'yende' becomes in verse 27, 'jende', elsewhere 'iende'. G. c. 19, v. 24 'uri' = 'rain' is now generally spelt 'euri', but one hears 'uri' sometimes, e. g. at Ibarron sur Nivelle. Harismendi p. 93 has 'vrioc' = 'you rains there'. 'Uri' also means 'town', 'village'. Perhaps 'Eugi' in Navarra comes from 'euri' = 'uri'. G. c. 19, v. 27; c. 20, v. 8; c. 21, v. 14; c. 31, v. 55 we find 'goiz',

---

[1] It needs no arguing to shew that 'cataloguing' is a barbarous word. 'Catalogging' would be better.

but 'goiç' is d'Urtes general spelling. In means 'rising' (of the sun), 'morn', 'early'. G. c. 19, vv. 33, 34, 35 'etçan' and 'etcin' are used as mere variants. Señor F. de Arrese ta Beitia, poet and carpenter of Ochandiano in Biscaya, told me that the former means to 'lie face downwards' and the latter to 'lie on ones back'. The distinction is as fanciful as that of Canon Inchauspe who has written that the directive case-ending 'ra'='to', 'into' is used when mere motion 'towards' is implied, and its equivalent 'rát' when 'staying in the position reached' is intended. Over-definition is sometimes as dangerous as utter vagueness. Let the old authors decide! Harismendi p. 150, has 'etcite' for 'setting' of the sun and 'etcin oherat'='go to bed'. Materre, p. 323, has 'etcin çaite'='lie thou down into bed'. G. c. 22, v. 2. 'bakhótcha' and v. 12 'bakhoitça' both translate 'unique'. G. c. 26 'Abimele-quec' is also written 'Abimelecquec'.

G. c. 48, 16. 'Isaquen', but generally 'Isaaquen'='of Isaac'.

G. cc. 49 and 50. The 'm' final of 'Ephraim' is turned into 'n' in the oblique cases. The same thing happens with that of 'Abraham'. 'Abrahan' occurs as a nominative c. 17, 7. The name of 'Adam' remains unchanged. In Duvoisins Labourdin version, made from the Latin of the Vulgate edition, 'Adam' and 'Abraham' preserve their 'm' in all cases. Harismendi has 'Abrahani' p. 105; but 'Abrahami' p. 163.

G. c. 36, vv. 2 and 14 there is 'gtipia', but elsewhere correctly 'ttipi'. It is pronounced 'chipi'. 'Philistindar' and 'Philistintar' occur as variants. The former shewing the 't' mutated after 'n' is the more correct. D'Urtes use of 'ar', 'dar', 'tar' is remarkable. It means not merely belonging to such and such a 'place', as in 'Egiptuar', but to a 'tribe', as in the above word and 'Hebrear', 'Ismaelitar', 'Israeltar' etc. It probably is the same ending that we have in 'indar'='strength'='wont to do', 'senar'='child-lover'='husband' etc., meaning originally 'fond of', 'apt to'.

From ch. 40 onwards 'quien' is frequently used instead of 'quign' ='kiñ' as the copulative or unitive case-ending, meaning 'with'; e. g. c. 45, v. 1; c. 46, vv. 1 and 6; c. 47, v. 1, 'guciequien'; c. 49, v. 30 'larrearequien'; c. 50, v. 14, 'harequien'; c. 46, v. 7, 'bere-quien'; c. 43, v. 5, 'çuéquien'; vv. 8 and 16, 'enequien'; c 44, v. 6, 'gurequien'; v. 14, 'anajequien'; but c. 42, v. 4, 'anajequign', and Ex: c. 4. summary 'batéquien'.

D'Urte perhaps follows some phonetic instinct in distinguishing 'n' from 'ñ' as a final letter. Ex: c. 4, v. 10, 'guerostic' is gene-rally spelt 'gueroztic'='since'.

2. CASTILIANISMS. If Pierre d'Urte used too many words taken from the 'Erdara'[1] or 'Romance' without any need, the same may be said of all Bask writers.   His native place, 'Donibane Lohizun' (= marshy St. John) was so important a station on the road from Spain to Bordeaux that it had an hospice for those who went on pilgrimage to St. Jacques of Compostela, and the high street of Berriz in Biscaya was called 'calle de San Juán de Luz'.   Those who know Castilian will detect its influence throughout d'Urtes translation.   Only a few specimens are noted here.   G. c. 8, summary 'estatua' is not Castilian, but Latin 'statu' with a euphonic 'e' and the Baskish article 'a'.   G. c. 24, v. 5, 'sin falta'.

G. c. 26, v. 22, 'largóän', where Duvoisin rightly put 'zabalera'.

G. c. 32, v. 12, 'podore' from 'poder' is perhaps a 'lapsus calami', or a local variety on the analogy of 'dolore' or 'ohore'= 'honor'.

G. c. 43, v. 9, and c. 44, v. 32, 'cauçione errendatçen' or 'errendatu' is a Castilian rendering of 'répondre'.

G. c. 38, v. 14, 'belo' and 'habituac'; G. c. 32, summary, 'arribada'.

Ex: c. 12, vv. 41 and 51, 'egun proprio hartan' ought to be, as we may see, Ex: c. 19, v. 1, 'egun hartan berean' = 'en ce même jour-là'.   In the first place Calvins words 'en ce propre jour-là' have been too nearly followed.

Ex: c. 13, v. 17, and c. 19, v. 22 'perbentura' has not even its equal in the French.

Ex: c. 13, v. 21, 'coluna' instead of the native 'habe' (? Latin 'abies') which is used by writers of the first rank such as Dechepare, Harismendi, Capánaga, Larramendi shews at least the Bask dislike of 'mn'.

---

[1] 'Erdara' means the 'language' spoken by the neighburs of the Basks, e. g. Béarnais, Gascon, French and Castilian.   It is perhaps derived from 'eritarra' = 'indigenous', 'belonging to the land', 'native', 'dweller in', 'landsman'. Harismendi on p. 151 used it in this sense, spelling it 'hertar', from which 'erdara' is the definite form in the old spelling of 'r' for 'rr'. If so, this points back to a time when the Vascongados (i. e. Vascon-ic-ati) found themselves newcomers among a native population which spoke a language different from their own.   To the French in Madagascar, for instance, the most important forane tongue is that of the 'interior' of the iland, that of the 'natives'. Goyhetche in his 'Fabliac' p. 259, uses 'erdara' apparently in the sense of 'language' in general: "Suge malurusac aldiz bere erdaran ahal beçain molde onean baderro" = 'the wretched serpent in turn says to him in his "erdara", in as good form as he can'.   This shews that the Basks used it contemptuously at least in former times.

Ex: c. 14, v. 30, the word 'descantssatu'=Castilian 'descansado' in the sense of 'aid', 'deliver' is a bad specimen of degenerate 'erdarism'.

Ex: c. 15, v. 3, 'balent' for 'valiant', instead of 'bihotzdun' or 'indartsu'. v. 8, 'curri' for 'running' waters. 'Laster-egin' is the word for 'run'.

Ex: c. 21, v. 13, 'guardian'='on the look out for', 'on guard', would be better turned by 'begira'.

Ex: c. 21, v. 8 'desloialqui comportatcen'='être perfide'; v. 28, 'lapidatu' and 'quito' are very weak.

Ex: c. 25, v. 4 'etchatu' for 'jetté' from Castilian 'echar' is abject. D'Urte or his amanuensis put a great many superfluous dots over his vowels, presumably to prevent Gallicism in pronunciation. He imitated the oldest Baskish song, and the oldest Baskish letter, in putting them over the letter 'y'. The same peculiarity occurs in the famous English epitaph of Earl Richard Beauchamp (about A. D. 1445) in the collegiate church of Warwick. It is noticeable in the MS, and the Oxford edition, that some words meant to be catchwords are placed so as not to fulfil their purpose. They look like vain repetitions in perusing the text.

Among d'Urtes Gallicisms 'banquet' and 'buquet' are conspicuous. Leiçarraga also used 'banquet'.

3. WORDS AND PHRASES OF LINGUISTIC INTEREST. 'Ethórquiä', the word used by d'Urte to translate the Greek Genesis, in G. c. 2, v. 4, 'generation', is still in use. It is of course the best word. Duvoisin in his translation in the same dialect renders it by the uneyeable bastard 'Jenesa'! But Uriarte has 'Genesisco', equally bad. 'Etórkia', as it is now spelled, may be found in various books of the 17th and 18th centuries, e. g. in the 'Dotrina Christiana' or 'Catechism' of Esteve Materre (Bordeaux, 1617 and 1623) of which the Bodleian Library provides the only copy known. There, on page 64, it means the 'proceeding' of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, as defined by St. Athanasios. On p. 162 it occurs in the phrase: "ceren nola Adamec becatu eguin çuenean likistu eta nothatu baitçuen bere ethorquia eta naturaleça", i. e. "for as Adam, when he did sin, did defile and brand his 'origin' and nature." Sebastian Mendiburu used it too. Page XIX Mr. Thomas has an interesting note on 'orkaitz'. The word probably comes from the Latin 'furca' like 'ondo' from Latin 'fundo' or 'fundum'. If so it is to be likened psychologically to the German 'gabel-bock', or 'fork-goat', i. e. 'young deer'.

G. c. 1, v. 11, 'egozkia' stands for French 'jet'.   For this word
see 'giet' in Godefroys Dictionary of Old French.   Monsieur H.
L. Fabre in his French-Baskish Dictionary translates 'suçon' by
'egóskia'.   Is it of the same root as 'eguskia', 'iguskia' = 'the
'sun' i. e. 'the cauldron', or 'boiling instrument' or 'matter',
of the Universe from 'egosi' = 'boiled'; or as 'egotzi' = 'thrown
out', 'gegossen'?   G. c. 2, v. 23, 'guiçonquia' perhaps shews that
d'Urte thought of English 'woman' which obviously suggests
'man'.   'Emasteki' is known as a synonym of 'emazte' the
ordinary word for 'woman'.   By analogy therefore 'gizonki',
which is not in Larramendi, ought to be a synonym of 'gizon' =
'man'.   For the termination 'qui' = 'ki' see p. 14, v. 13 'estalki'
= 'material for covering'; f. 90, v. 27, 'arrapaki' and 'atze-
manki' = 'material caught and taken'; f. 12, v° v. 14 'herrestaki'
= 'thing that creepeth', and other words in d'Urtes text.

G. c. 2, v. 11.   The expression 'sortcen baita urrea' is poetical
and true to nature; "the gold is born."   'Sorte inuenitur aurum'.

G. c. 3, v. 11, 'jatera' is perhaps a miswriting of 'jatea', and so
the accusative of 'bainaroen'.

G. c. 7, v. 11, and 8, v. 2.   'Tapac' renders the French 'bondes',
and the English 'windows'.   Littré explains 'bonde' as "Large
ouverture de fond, destinée à laisser écouler toute l'eau de l'étang
quand on retire le tampon qui la bouche ordinairement."   D.
Martin in his French Bible of 1707 has a note to the same effect.
The Greek and Latin translations have 'cataracts', which in
'Heuskara'[1] would be 'urjaiotsak', 'ataskak', 'eurijasak',
'ekachak', 'ekaitzak'.   D'Urte uses 'tapatu', the past participle,
in c. 26, vv. 15 and 18, where St. Jerome has 'obstruere'.   This
points to Castilian 'tapa' = 'lid', 'cover', 'stopper', 'cork',
'bouchon', 'propfe'.   In Catalan this is 'tap'.   D'Urte may have
even thought of English 'taps'.   But the idea of 'uncorking'
'untapping', or 'tapping' the heavens to produce the universal
flood is unworthy of the Aeschylean sublimity of the Egyptian sage.

---

[1] The Baskish tongue is called by the Basks themselves 'Heuskara',
'Heskuara', 'Euskara', 'Euskera', 'Uskara', 'Eskara', etc. at different epochs
and in different dialects.   Some people explain it as meaning 'hitz-kera' =
'manner of word', 'mund-art'.   Sir Thomas Browne, who studied the
language in the reign of King Charles II, called it 'Basquish'.   It is best to
follow his example, and to reserve 'Bask' as the name of the 'Heuskaldunak'
or 'Baskish-holders' as the Basks call themselves.   But, as 'Basquish' is liable
to be pronounced as a rime to 'vanquish', I venture to spell it 'Baskish' on
the German model, to suit Finnish, Turkish, Swedish, etc.

G. c. 7, v. 6, 'ur uholdea', if it be not a miswriting of 'uru-holdea', shews that Baskish as known to d'Urtes people was obliged to say 'the water-flood of water', instead of simply 'the flood of water'. They must have been unable to conceive of 'a flood' separated from the notion of 'water'. And in truth we seldom hear of floods produced by any other liquid. The etymology of 'uholde' gives us its initial 'u' as a mere compositional form of 'ur' = 'water'. Then the word became so far a generic term that it did not seem absurd to use it with 'ur' as the constitutive or genitival radical to shew that the flood was an inundation of water. It was in fact a making of the waters to stand upon a heap, a carrying of sea coal to Newcastle. It recalls the habitual use in Portuguese of 'uma chavena de cha' = 'a teacup of tea'! There 'the teacup', at first a proper noun, became so far a generic term = 'cup' or 'taza' that its own 'etymon' could be used again as a limiting, specific, or qualifying noun-adjective. In the same way d'Urte has 'ur-ithurriak' = 'water-springs' on f. 38, v° v. 13, f. 40, v. 43; and f. 38, v° v. 11 'ur-phutçu' = 'water-well'. It is to be compared with the name of the river 'Uru-mea', once 'Guru-mea', at San Sebastián, meaning apparently 'the shallow-water'. The name of Lake 'Urumiya' in Persia is pronounced like that of the Gipuskoan river. For 'e' before 'a' final in Baskish sounds like English 'e' in 'he'. Blackies Modern Cyclopaedia (1890) says of that inland sea: "It is extremely shallow throughout." The second 'u' in 'Urumea' is generally explained as an euphonic link. It is not likely that it was once an integral part of the word 'hur', 'ur' = 'water'. Cf. 'zur-u-bi' = 'zurbi'. G. c. 7, v. 13 'baijta' and c. 12, v. 17 'baÿta' are rather Gipuskoan than Labourdin. The latter dialect usually has 'baieta' = 'yea also'.

G. c. 11, v. 4. Where the French has 'soit', in Italic, and the Jacobean English of 1611 "may reach", d'Urte ought to have put the Subjunctive 'den' instead of the Imperative 'içan bedi', though this is not untranslatable if taken to mean "and a tower, of the which let the point be up to heaven."

G. c. 12, v. 10. The now famous use of 'emaztebat' = 'une femme' instead of 'une famine', points to confusion between these expressions in the authors mind; and is alone enough to warrant the conjecture that the translation was made as I have suggested above. After being a Capuchin monk he seems to have made much of women! Not only was he married twice and had a daughter, but he gives a capital initial to 'Alaba' = 'the daughter'

and 'Emaztea' and 'Emea'='the woman'. On p. 228 of La Revue de Linguistique, Tome 30, we read "Meeting October 10, 1719. That Peter d'Urte is married without the consent of the Commissioners, for which he was excluded in the last distribution, since which he is gone off with his daughter by a former wife." So his 'femme' in very truth possibly came as a synonym of 'famine' to him, as a 'gossete urthe'='famine year' (G. c. 14, v. 27), or 'gosse d'Urte'= hungry d'Urte "Ta feme moir ny croutyn." (E. Faragher, p. 70 of Aesops Fables in Manx, Douglas 1901). Necessity is the mother of invention.

G. c. 14, v. 11; and 43, vv. 20 and 22 'ianhari' means 'victuals'. In G. c. 44, vv. 1 and 4 'ianhari naussia'='the victuals-master', just as c. 40, v. 1, 'ogui-jabe'='bread-master', i. e. 'baker'; and in v. 2, 'ogui-iabe naussia'='the chief baker', the master baker.

G. c. 14, v. 23, 'hiré diren gaüça guçietaric' gives us the possessive case or adjective used indefinitely. Other instances occur; e. g. c. 12, v. 20, 'eta haren çiren gauça guçiac'; c. 46, v. 1 'bere çituen gauça guçiequien', v. 10 'eta hire diren gauça guçiac'.

G. c. 18, v. 16; and Ex: c. 16, v. 16, 'Neurri' is used rightly in in its proper sense as 'measure', but on ff. 75, 84, 85, 86, 129 it is used for 'nourrir' though 'entretenitu' is more correctly used to mean this elsewhere. 'Hazi' is of course the word that d'Urte should have used, one of the links, perhaps, between Keltic and Baskish. As 'ideas,' 'seed' and 'nourishment' are 'the beginning' of all conceptions of organic life[1] 'Neurri,' probably derived from the Béarnais language, was used also by Haraneder in the sense of 'nourish': e. g. in 'Gudu Izpirituala' (1750) pp. 279 and 286; and by Goyhetche, Curé of Urruña and uncle of Pierre Goyetche, Maire of Sara, on p. 277 of his badly punctuated translation of the 'Fables' of Lafontaine, an interesting work in which he was assisted by M. le Chanoine Maurice Harriet, of Halzu, who is still living. It is a curious coincidence that 'mezur' means 'nourriture' in Breton.

G. c. 19, v. 27, between 'eta' and 'lekhura' some words such as 'igan çen' or 'ioan çen' seem to have been left out in the MS. The French is 'vint au lieu'.

G. c. 22, v. 10, 'cintçurrac egiteco', literally 'to do the throats'

---

[1] See Pliny, and Professor J. Rhys in Lectures on Welsh Philology. Professor Rhys wrote to me on the 21st of December, 1891, "I have long since spotted Plinys ponies. What you say about Basque *asi* and the Alpine *asia* is very interesting."

= 'to cut the throat'. The expression perhaps comes from the Béarnais. On p. 22 of "Quelques Légendes Poétiques du Pays de Soule" by Jean de Jaurgain, one finds "de quoi le chrestiaa (cagot) de Tardets *ly fe las gorges*," where the last words in Italic, mean "cut (lit. did) his 'throats', i. e. 'throat'."

G. c. 24, v. 3, 'iuramentu eraguignen;' Ex: c. 9, v. 18 'uria eraguitera nihoac' = 'je m'en vais faire pleuvoir'; and v. 20 'ihes eraguin çioten etçhetara haren çerbitçariey eta haren bestiey', where it governs a dative, the French being 'fit promptement retirer dans les maisons ses serviteurs et ses bêtes', are places in which 'eragin' = 'to make to do, to cause to make' is used in its normal sense as the causative form of 'egin'. But we find it in d'Urte usurping the functions of 'eraci' = 'to cause' e. g. G. c. 36, v. 24; and c. 37, v. 2 'ianeraguin' = 'to make to make to eat'; G. c. 37, vv. 12, 13, 16 and passim 'basceraguiten' (sic for 'bazqueraguiten') 'to cause to make to feed', and there it is peculiar, probably a sole-cism. In G. c. 29, v. 8 'edara' is rightly used for 'abbreuver' = 'to make to drink'.

G. c. 24, v. 43. The construction 'ur chorta bat' = 'a drop of water' seems the most rational but f. 26, v. 7 'ithurri ur' = 'fount (of) water' is more in accordance with the modern usage for the position of the radical indicating contents or constituents. Cf. 'ur phutçu' above, and 'ur-uholde'.

G. c. 24, v. 44. The use of the active form of the vocative of the pronoun of the 2nd person in 'edantçac hic' is interesting. Leiçarraga also uses it.[1] But the rule does not appear to be fixed. The vocative can be passive even with the imperative of an active verb, e. g. f. 37, v°, v. 11, and f. 47, v. 27. In G. c. 27, v. 26, we see it so used: 'eta mussu emadac, ene sémeä'. We see it also pas-sive with the 2nd person singular of an active verb in the indicative mood, thus G. c. 38, v. 29, 'heürrori' following 'eguin dioan.' Also in Ex: c. 4, v. 13, 'helas Iauna! egortçac', it is passive with the imperative and in c. 5, v. 22, with the indicative, as follows: 'Iauna, cergatican gaizqui trataraci duc poblu hau'?

G. c. 25, summary, 'ema ohe lagunen', and v. 6, 'ema oheco lagunen' are remarkable words meaning 'bed-fellow female'.

[1] Professor W. I. Knapp, whom I had the pleasure of meeting in Oxford in October 1901, possessed a perfect copy which is not mentioned in Professor J. Vinsons Bibliographie Basque, of this authors Baskish New Testament of 1571, republished in 1900 at Strassburg in Elsass. He sold it to Mr. Archer M. Huntington, Westchester County, State of New York. A third edition is to be published in London by the Trinitarian Bible Society in 1903.

G. c. 25, v. 18; c. 27, v. 23, and c. 9, v. 15, 'anaia bat', are places shewing that d'Urte treated 'anaia' not 'anai' as the radical form of the Heuskarian word for 'brother'. Christophe Harismendi did the same e. g. pages 21 and 24 of 'Ama Virginaren Hirur Officioac' (Bordeaux, 1660) in the Labourdin dialect.[1] Cf. G. c. 2, v. 10, 'ibaia bat': Ex: c. 22, summary 16, 'birjina bat'. In modern authors the etymological 'a' final of nouns is sometimes confounded with the definite article and treated as separable. This is robbery. D'Urte used 'besti' so.

G. c. 25, v. 25, and c. 30, v. 40, 'gorricara' is for 'roux'. In G. c. 25, v. 30, ' de ce roux-là' is translated 'horraco errequi hortaric (erreki = burnt or roasted matter)'.

G. c. 27, vv. 26 and 28. In 'baitut' one sees 'bai' used for 'ba' as the conditional. This is probably an error, though not unknown in other authors. In v. 21 etc., the true form 'ba-da' preceded by 'baldim' is found, and not 'baita' which would be right if 'bai' coud be a conditional prefix.

G. c. 28, v. 12, 'ukitzen', which usually means 'touching', is used in the sense of 'reaching up to' heaven. In G. c. 27, v. 21, it stands for 'tâter'. Gen. c. 25, v. 22 he has 'alegueratcen' meaning 'sporting', 'rejoicing', ' making merry'. This is an eccentric rendering of ἐσκίρτων in the Greek of the Septuagint, and savours of 'saltabant' or 'exultabant' more than of 'collidebantur', the third variant found in the Vulgate editions. Duvoisin has 'gudukatzen' = 'fighting'. The versions in Calvins French of the 16th century and that of 1707 have "s'entrepoussoyent" but the Castilian of F. T. Amat (Madrid, 1832) has 'chocaban entre si ó luchaban', while the French version of E. Reuss gives "s'entrechoquaient". Can d'Urte have mistaken the sense and thought of 'jocose'?

G. c. 28, v. 21. Mr. Llewelyn Thomas asked me to find an instance of this form in French ' Heuskara '. I have seen it elsewhere. M. J. Vinson omits it in his Appendix.

---

[1] The title means ' The Three Offices of the Virgin Mother'. It is not merely a liturgical curiosity, but a valuable literary landmark. I had just received news of the publication of M. J. Vinsons avowedly incomplete, and demonstrably ill-printed, edition, when Bodleys Librarian let me know (30 Sept. 1901) that the University of Oxford owns the only known perfect copy. It consists of 236 pages, and formed part (Maresch. 439) of the Library of T. Marshall, Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford who died there in 1685. His epitaph may be read on the pavement of the chancel of the adjoining church of All Saints. See Notes and Queries for 9 November, 1901.

G. c. 30, v. 13. 'ils diront' becomes 'erraungo' for 'erranen' with a superfluous 'go', perhaps a solecism.

G. c. 30, v. 35. 'çhuri non ere baitçiren guçiac' = "toutes celles ou il y avoit du blanc," is literally "all who were in any place whatever white."

G. c. 33, v. 8, 'edirecotçat', and Ex. c. 6, v. 13, 'atheratçecótçat' are interesting as shewing the case ending 'tzat' piled upon another 'co', of practically the same force. It is the equivalent of English 'for to'.

G. c. 33, v. 16. 'appaisé' is rendered 'esmaratu. Is this a common word? Is it derived from the Latin 'ex' and 'mare' as if referring to a sea that is 'un-sea-ed'? or from Castilian 'esmerar' or 'esbarar'? John Stevens, in his Castilian-English Dictionary of 1706, translates 'esbarar' by 'to glide' or 'slip along'. The Basks might have taken the word in the sense of 'make' or 'become smooth and peaceful'. The change of 'b' into 'm' is common. The English equivalent is 'pleased'. The LXX have εὐδοκήσεις με. The Welsh 'ammori' is not unlike it in form and meaning. In 'hec hill içatu eta, eta pillatu çuten hiria', G. c. 34, v. 27, we have a notable case of 'eta' = 'after' ('that'), followed by 'eta' = 'and'.

G. c. 35, v. 14. The French 'aspersion' is rendered 'ihinztur' perhaps a solecism, derived from 'ihinz' = 'dew'. Aizkibel does not imbook this word, but 'intz-emaillea' = 'aspersorio', literally 'the dew-giver'. The English Jacobean version has 'drink-offering'.

G. c. 37, v. 4. This case of the negative and the affirmative potential sub-auxiliaries 'ecin' and 'ahal' used in one clause, but yet not annihilating each other, is not unique in Baskish literature, but worthy of note.

G. c. 37, v. 5. 'abilla' = 'goest thou?' is perhaps the only occurrence in this book of the interrogative sign used with verbal forms, i. e. 'a' final.

G. c. 37, v. 8. 'baldim bahintç?' as a simple interrogative, and not a conditional, is remarkable. I treated 'baldim' as a slip of the pen and omitted it in the 2nd edition.

G. c. 40, v. 14. 'gogara' for 'gogora' occurs elsewhere in d'Urte and other writers.

G. c. 40, v. 19, etc. The use of 'çur' = 'zur' in the sense of 'tree' is very interesting. Leiçarraga in his New Testament (1571, and 1900) uses it in the same way, e. g. Acts c. 13, v. 19; c. 5, v.

30; c. 10, v. 40 of the 'lignum crucis'. It generally means
'wood', ὕλη, that has been felled at least, if not cut up. It may be
as near a relative to Latin 'suber' as it is to Baskish 'su'='fire',
which d'Urte articulates 'suba', e. g. G. c. 19, v. 24. In
Cataluña, e. g. in the contry named after 'Ruscino' from Keltic
'ruskin'='bark' which always was its principal product, cork-
trees are called 'suros', and their 'wood' much used for 'fires'.
R. Micoleta (or Nicoleta?) in his manuscript dated 1653, published
for the third time in 1897, at Sevilla, renders it by 'viga'='beam'.
'Suriya' is the name of a particular tree in Ceylon.   Baskish
'zurea'='the tree' and 'zuria'='the white' is pronounced
like this.   There are some places in modern Baskish, 'Souraide'
='wood-air', or 'wood-fellow' for instance, which have this
word in the etymology of their names, and it probably explains
that of the village of 'Soure' in Portugal, famous for its store
of timber stacks, on the edge of a vast primeval pine-forest, and
that of 'Soria' in Spain, and possibly 'Zoria' in Greece, also.
'Zuria', in the Province of Barcelona, is on the border of an
immense pine-forest.   Voltoire has 'sur' in the sense of 'fire'.   The
Gipuskoans sometimes say 'surtan' for "in the fire."   'Surtu'
means 'afervorizarse'.   In Icelandic 'fyri'= both 'fire' and 'fir-
tree'.   Some one has proposed that the 'Suburra' of Rome came
from 'zur-bi-buru-a', which is the name of several places and one
parish in the Pays Basque, meaning 'bridge-head', 'bridge-end',
from 'zur-bi' or 'zu-bi'='bridge', formed of 'zur'='bit of wood',
'plank,' and 'bi'='two'.   Who has not seen rustic bridges thus
made in the Pyrenean valleys?   'Zuru-bi'='ladder' (G. c. 28, v.
12) is the same word.   The Japanese too look at a 'ladder' and a
'bridge' from the same point of view.   'Sybaris' might well be
derived from 'su'='fire' and 'barri'='new', if one remembers
the tradition of 'the fire' inaugurating the infant colonies of the
Greeks, such as 'Cumae', the name of which is like Baskish
'kume', 'hume',='child'.   Baskish is rich in words for 'tree'.
Harismendi uses, p. 98, 'zuhaitz', and pp. 103 and 131 'zuhaitz
landarea' (='sapling'), and p. 94 'çuhamuioc' probably for
'zuhaumeoc'.   This last was also used by B. Dechepare.

G. c. 41 Calvins 'jeune vache' is rendered quite wrongly 'jeune
veau'.   But in v. 26 the Baskish drops the equivalent of 'jeune'.
'Chahal' or 'chaal' is 'calf', 'becerro' in the modern language,
everywhere from Bilbao to Bayonne, from Pamplona to San
Sebastián.   D'Urte renders the words "et des vaches qui allaitent"

in G. c. 33, v. 13 by 'eta chahal esnecumedunez', meaning literally 'and with calves that-have-milk-children'. Here his mistake seems all the more silly; talking about a calf that has a sucking young one! In other places we see that he was not clever at natural history. Duvoisin rightly renders 'vache' by 'behi'= 'cow'. This word may be of Gothic origin, akin to 'faihu' and German 'vieh'.

G. c. 41, v. 38, 'ahal giñezake is a case of the potential pleonasm occasionally used by other writers, even Leiçarraga; to be able to be able! So also Ex. c. 7, v. 24, 'eta eçign edan baitçeçaquéten ibayeco uretican'. Ignorant Englishmen sometimes say "can be able."

G. c. 41, v. 47 "abundantcia iraun demboran' = 'during the time (of) the lasting (of) abundance' is a very English stringing together of radicals.

G. c. 42, v. 7. 'aleguia' is composed of 'ala' the interrogative prefix and 'eguia'='the truth', in Castilian '¿ es verdad ?'

See Larramendi under 'montas'. It does not, however, mean 'equidem' here, but 'pretense'='pretext'. It is not of course 'alegia'='granary' or 'grain-land, which is the name of some places in Spanish Baskland, converted by the Castilians into 'Alegria'='joy'!

G. c. 42, v. 16, 'Espioneac çaretela' gives an instance of what I call "la Béarnais," because 'la' in this Baskish idiom has no more apparent reason than the 'que' that precedes the verb in Béarnais, or in the Portuguese "Desde hontem á noite que tem caido chiuva miuda"='since last night ('over-night', 'yester-night', 'ante noctem ') fine rain has been falling.'

G. c. 44, v. 18, 'orayderagno' = 'jusques à présent'. The 'de' ='re' appears superfluous here, cf. 'Noereragno' c. 5, summary.

G. c. 44, v. 31, 'car tu es comme Pharaon' has been amplified into 'ecen ezaiz Pharaon bagno guehiago ez gutiago'="for thou art not more nor less than Pharaoh."

G. c. 45, v. 22, 'cilharra' at once recalls English 'silver'. It may be derived from 'Zilo'='hole' and 'arra'='belonging to'. A mine is a hole in the mountain, and silver is a mineral. There are villages in Spain where the people live in holes scooped out of sandstone strata. Such would be called 'Siluria' in Baskish= 'the town of holes', the name of a part of Britain.

Baskish 'uria' and 'hiria'='the town', possibly explains some place-names which occur in ancient Greek and Latin books. In

searching for an etymology in the mysterious darkness that en-
shrouds the origin of Baskish words, and the former wanderings
of Basks before they enter into history, one thinks of Sanskrit
'puri', 'pur', Hebrew 'hir', Sumerian 'uru', Assyrian 'uri', Welsh
'hir', 'yr'. Possibly as a town is a 'vecindad' in Spain, the
Baskish postposition 'iri-an' = 'nigh unto' may teach us what
was the first concept of the word, not a watering-place or oasis
in the desert; but a 'neighburhood'.

G. c. 47, vv. 17 and 18, the expressions 'ardi artaldeen', 'idi
'artaldeen,' 'hacienda artáldeäc' seem to suggest that 'art' in
'artalde' is not short for 'ardi' = 'sheep'; but for 'arta' = 'arreta'
= 'care'. It would be as absurd to talk about 'sheep-folds of
sheep', 'sheep-folds of oxen', 'sheep-folds of cattle', as of 'water-
floods of water'. 'Talde', however, is possibly distinct from 'alde'.

G. c. 49, v. 17, 'erori' was at first 'eroritcen' apparently, or
'eroriren'. The scribe has altered it for the worse. In the English
it is in the future. The French is 'afin que ... tombe'. Ibidem
the MS omits 'duc' after 'icango'. The editions have erred in not
reinstating it.

Gen: c. 49, v. 26. 'aldaquen' would be 'aldapen', in Gipuskoan.
The word is not unknown at Cambo on the Nive. Perhaps it
comes from Castilian 'falda' = 'slope'.

Ex: c. 2, v. 3, the word 'arrossategui', which can only mean
"bed of roses", is incorrectly used where 'ihi-tegi' would be more
suitable. D'Urte, with his evident ignorance of natural history,
translated the French 'roseau' = 'seska,' 'canabera', in too flowery
a style! the English here has 'flags'; the Greek τὸ ἐλῶδες μέρος and
ἐν τῷ ἕλει; the Latin 'carecto' and 'papyrione' the Castilian
'carrizal'. Larramendi gives 'ugarrizadi' for this last word.

Ex: c. 2, v. 5, 'Nescato' and 'nescatcha' appear as synonyms.
This fact alone is enough to show that D. Pedro Novia de Salcedo
(who knew very little Baskish, as his grand-daughters told me
at Seville) was wrong when he stated in his Dictionary that
'nescato' is an 'augmentative'!

Ex. c. 3, v. 15, the French pronunciation of 'saeculorum' is
recorded in the word 'seculorónecotç.

One is surprised here and there at our authors violent use
of the radical in the sense of the constitutive genitive where one
would expect the 'mediative case', e. g. Ex. c. 48. v. 19, 'abundant-
cia bethea', 'abundance-full' instead of 'full of' or 'with abun-
dance'. 'Abundantciaz' would seem more expectable. He seems

to use the accusative quite as often as the genitive for the object of the transitive verbal nouns. In French Baskish as a rule, the genitive is used, while the Gipuskoan Dialect affects the accusative. In old English too we find such phrases as "the shutting the door" instead of "of the door".

Ex: XI, v. 7, where Calvin has 'chien', d'Urte put 'ozar'= 'hound'. Mr. Thomas was told that this word is obsolete. I have myself used the word in Navarre and was understood. One finds it on p. 60 of 'Credo edo Sinhesten Dut' (Bayonne, 1891) a book in very good Labourdin, with whose author, Étienne Lapeyre, I have conversed, and in other modern books e. g. 'Misionetako Kantikak' (1892). It is a contraction of 'hora-zar' = 'old hound', or 'great' and 'terrible hound'.

The Abbé Chantre, ('Zubiburu-tarra') told me in the Petit Séminaire de Larresoro that 'chakur', the commonest word for 'dog', is derived from 'eche-ko hora' = 'chien de maison', 'house-dog'. Canon Harriet, of Halsou, rejects this on the ground that the 'r' in 'chakur' is doubled before the suffixes.

'Chakur' is probably from 'chainkor' = 'zainkor' = 'apt to watch'. 'Zainka' = 'to play the part of guardian', is used in the sense of 'to bark'. Others have connected it with 'chacal' an African wild dog.

On p. 110 of Lays of the Red Branch by Sir Samuel Ferguson, (London, MDCCCXCVII) this line occurs "A hound I saw, and heard him 'Ossar' called", and on the next this "Ossar! good dog, hie forth and chase the thieves!" As a Gaelic word 'osar' means "a bed, litter, a burden: the younger". This would not be so good a name for a dog as the Baskish word in question. Was it used as a dog-name in old Irish?

Ex: c. 13, vv. 12, 13, 15, the use of 'athea' = 'door-the' or 'womb-the' is probably a solecism in the language, and to be considered a 'mot savant', taken evidently from 'portiere', one of the meanings of which was 'matrice', as appears from the Dictionnaire de l'Ancienne Langue Française (Paris, 1889). In v. 12, it is used twice, translating first 'matrice' and then 'portiere'. In verses 13 and 15 it renders 'portiere'.

Ex: c. 14, v. 25, 'nequetç' is in favor of 'tz' being the old form of 'z' in such words as 'baietz' = 'di si, yesly'; 'ezetz' = 'noly'. So in Harismendi we find p. 82 'fitez', but pp. 47, 48, 94, and 158, etc. 'fitetz'; and p. 101, violatz' for 'violaz'. 'Itssass' in Ex: c. 14, v. 30; c. 15, v. 22, and Ex: c. 15, v. 4, 'itsass gorrian' = 'in

the red sea' is probably a miswriting of 'itsasso' which occurs in the foregoing verse. 'Itsass' as a radical meaning 'stick to', 'adhere', 'cleave to', 'Itsasso', which is pronounced with the article 'itsassua' is probably from 'itsass-ur'='sticky-water',which well describes the sea. 'Ura'='the water' is sometimes pronounced 'u-wa'. In Ex: c. 14, v. 30, however, we find 'itsass bazterrean'='on the sea-shore'. So too in Leiçarragas classical New Testament, to be reprinted at the Clarendon Press in 1903, we find 'itsas' frequently, e. g. St. Matt. c. xv, v. 29 with 'alde'='sea-side', v. 25 with 'gainez'='on the top of the sea', and elsewhere with 'costa'='the sea-coast'. So possibly 'itsas' alone can mean 'sea'.

Ex: c. 16, v. 16, 'hedetchea'='the tent', is apparently a d'Urtian word. It means literally the 'strap-house', or 'the stretch-house', not a bad name.

Ex: c. 22. sum: 16. 'birjina bat çuritçen duena'='celui qui suborne une vièrge'. The word 'çuri'='whiten', is used of 'stripping' the maize stalks in the 'artadiak'. Possibly it was the origin of 'chourineur' in the Parisian argot, a man who despoils others of their property and lives, and leaves them white.

D'Urtes accentual system differs a little from that of Leiçarraga.

The Appendix of Monsieur Julien Vinson.

This part of the edition is almost useless. It does not even serve as an index, because it is not paginal, and leaves the reader to find for him or herself such forms of the verb as it enrolls. But it does not indicate all of these. It is incomplete. Worse still, its translations are in many places incorrect. It includes 'da' ('he', 'she' or 'it is'), but omits 'du' ('he', 'she' or 'it has him', 'her' or 'it'), which is no less rare.

'Aite' means not 'tu pourrais être', but 'tu seras'. 'Baituc' f. 29. verso, is not 'tu les as certes, ô homme', but 'si'l y a'. 'Cioät does not mean 'Je l'ai à toi, ô homme', but 'Je l'ai à lui ô homme'. 'Etciaçontçat', f. 67, v. 9, does not mean "pour qui'l ne l'aie' pas à lui," but 'pour qu'il ne l'eut pas à lui'. 'Eztiacacala' f. 34 is not 'qu'il ne l'ait pas à lui ô homme', but 'qu'l ne l'ait pas à toi ô homme'. 'Guiaitezquec' is not 'nous ne pouvons pas l'avoir ô homme', but 'nous pouvons être ô homme'. 'Uque', f. 65, is not 'tu l'aurais' but 'tu l'auras'. There are other mistakes for which the printer is not to blame. Those who know a little Baskish will easily find them out. Why

does M. Vinson say "pour mieux expliquer certains auxiliaires dont la signification originale nous échappe, j'ai cru pouvoir me servir des verbes 'avoir' et 'être' que j'ai mis entre parenthèses"? It is true that for us the origin of the Baskish verb has to be sought in the 16th century. The earlier Basks must be blamed for not recording their language. But every Heuskaldun baby knows that these 'auxiliaries' are 'the Verb'; and that, when used in the absolute, their proper meaning is 'to have' and 'to be' respectively. 'Izan' can mean either! The context tells one which. We may compare this with the vulgar English 'aint' which means 'am not', 'have not', 'is not', 'has not', 'are not'. And there are other languages which have awkward homonyms in their verb. For instance Irish 'ata' translates 'am', 'art', 'is', 'are'; and 'nil' the negative of each of these. (See Simple Lessons in Irish by E. O'Growney, part 1, pp. 13, 22, edition of 1897.) 'Nik dut adatsa' means 'I have the head of hair'; but 'nik dut egiten odia' means 'I am making the channel' (literally: 'I have the channel a-making', 'in making').

So also 'tirtotcha da' means 'it is the cork',[1] while 'alashia erorten-da' means the 'plate-rack is a-falling', 'in falling', i. e. 'falling'. Why produce confusion where all is plain? 'The Verb' in the Heuskarian tongue is 'to be', 'to have', whether simply, or acting through a be-verbed radical, which shews 'how' the being and having are manifested, and determines the relation between the subject and its object or predicate. All Basks know that 'bait', 'beit', 'bai', 'bei', 'ba'[2] do often mean, as M. Vinson says, 'par ce que', though Dartayeta in his useful Guide ou Manuel de la Conversation &c. (1861, 1876 and 1893) may have been the first lexicologist or grammarian to mention this use of the affirmative prefix. It probably takes this sense as the 'locum-tenens' of some such word as 'Zeren' which formerly preceded it, but has retired from service. It is often capable of being rendered by 'since', 'that is to say', 'and in consequence', 'so that', 'to explain why', or even by the relative pronoun, as

---

[1] This word appears as 'Tortitça' in an edition of Voltoires 'Trèsor' which was added to the 'Bibliothèque de Bayonne' in 1895. Larramendi on p. 92 of his Dictionary wrote under the heading 'arbol': "El sudor, o humedad que suda el arbol, 'tortica'" The latter is probably a misprint for 'tortiça' = 'tortitça'.

[2] The 'b' becomes 'p' after the negative prefix 'es', which reminds one, when so fused, of Portuguese 'nanja' = 'nonjam'.

12

on p. 245, of a carelessly written volume entitled "Bihotz Sacratua-
ren Hilabetheco Escu-Liburua A. Basilio Joanna-teguy Benedic-
tanoac Escuaraz ezarria, Lasserre, liburu egilea baithan" (Bay-
onne, 1894) where 'ethorrico zaio eguna jautsico baita' means 'the
day will come to him in which he will come down'. M. Vinson
would translate the last two words 'because he is to come down'.
Cases are even known where it is used as a substitute for the
conjunctional suffix 'la' meaning 'that'; e. g. in Dechepares
'Rimes' (Bordeaux, 1545), the oldest known Baskish book, the
line 'Amorosac nahi nuque honat veha valite' = I should wish
(it) 'that' the amorous 'would look to this'; and in the
above-named book, p. 36, 'nahi ginuke giristino guziek
ohoratzen balute' = 'we should desire (it) that all Christians
would honour (it)'. In the 'Dotrinea' of Martin Ochoa de
Capánaga, p. 103 of the editions of 1656 and 1893 'deseandola
(la ocasion de pecar) de nuevo' is translated 'ostera baleuco
deseetan dabela' where the Baskish can only mean "desiring
'that' he should have it back again" equivalent to "desiring
it, if he should have it again". E. Materre p. 309 has 'eta
nahi nuque huni iarraiqui bacenenquitça" = 'and I would desire
(it) if you would follow him.' In Capánaga again, p. 105 the
meaning of 'edo gura leuqueala amesetan etorri balequioz alaaco
gauçaac ... alan içan baliz gura leuquiola' is "or desiring 'that'
such things should happen to him in dreams, ... desiring 'that'
it should be so." Also in Voltoires 'Trésor', p. 84, "Nahi nuke
har baziniessa" means "I should wish (it) 'that' you would take
(it) for me". In all these cases, where it will be noticed that
the ruling verb-word means 'desire', i. e. 'nahi', 'gura' 'deseetan',
it might be argued that 'ba' is still conditional, the sense being
" if all Christians would honour it, we should desire (it)"; "if
you took (it) for me, I should consent" etc. One knows that
in Catalan also 'si' = 'if' is used instead of 'que' = 'that', when
the clause which it introduces is in any way a matter of doubt.
But a case like 'baditeke arima bat baino gehiago hitz
horiec beretzat hartzeco balituzke' on p. 116 of B. S. H. is harder
to explain. Either the 'ba' here really represents the relative pro-
noun 'Zein' or the whole sentence is very clumsily put together.
On p. 271 in the sentence 'Lokharri hortaz bertze guziac hausten
baginitu ere, bainan hori ez, baginuke aski, gure bihotza ez-
pailiteke nihoiz bat-egin Jesus Jaunarenarekin,' the first 'ba' means
'if' the second 'indeed', and 'ez-pai,' 'because ... not' or 'to result

in . . . not'. On p. 22 of 'Giristino Perfeccioniaren Pratica' (120 in M. Vinsons Bibliography) the words "cerc eguiten du Gincoaganaco gaucetan etor çunbait aldiz pitçu, eta eneatzen baita, eta beste aldi çunbaitez iniki, eta goçoz eguiten baititu?" can only mean "what brings it about *that* one is sometimes depressed and bored in the things that concern God, and *that* he does them at some other times easily and with pleasure?" 'Bai' cannot possibly mean 'because' here. The grammars do not appear to mention this use of the prefix 'ba' or 'bai' in the senses of the relative pronoun or the conjunctional suffix 'la'. But, on the whole, one may safely say that it can never mean 'parceque' when it occurs in a relative clause, or when preceded by a relative conjunction like 'non' ('no-n, in which')='where,' 'so that,' 'at which' or by words like 'zeren,' 'ezen,' 'nola' which themselves mean 'because' or 'how.' It may be seen therefore plainly that of all the verbal forms with this prefix in Pierre d'Urtes work there are only two, and those only for one occurrence, where this meaning is common-sensically possible. They are 'baita' in verse 15 on folio 125, 'Hori duc poblua ethórtçen baita eneganat,' = "This, man, is 'because' the people come(s) to-me-wards". But even here the words might be rendered, "(The fact) is ('man!') that the people cometh unto me", taking 'bai' as the conjunction 'que' or "This (man!), is the people 'which' doth come unto me", taking 'bai' as the relative pronoun 'qui'. The French, however, being "*C'est* que, le peuple vient à moi", the sense of 'parceque' is just admissible. The other case is Ex: c. 14, v. 11 'baicaituc' where the sense of 'bai' is, however, rather 'in that', 'seeing that', 'since', 'to explain why,' than 'parceque.' In English it is 'that thou hast made us go out from Egypt", in French, "de nous avoir fait sortir d'Egypte?" Yet Mr. Vinson attaches this causal sense to 73 such forms! He sees 'parceque' where there is none in Moses, Calvin, or d'Urte. One could not spare space enough for the examination of each occurrence of every form that has this prefix; but let a few instances be adduced as a 'reductio ad absurdum.' Genesis c. 4, v. 1, 'Adamec bada eçagutu çuen bere Emaztea, çegnac conçebitu bait-çuen, eta erdi baitçen Caignez, eta erran bait-çuen, içatu dut guiçonbat Eternalganic': Which Mr. Vinsons 'passe-partout' would turn into, "So Adam knew his wife because she had conceived and been delivered of Cain, and because she said, I have gotten a man from God". Gen. c. 4, v. 9. " Eta Eternalac erran

çioen Caigni, non da Abel hire anaia? çegnac ihardetssi baitçuen etçeaquiät, ene anaiaren guarda naiz? ni?" "And the Eternal said to Cain, Where is Abel thy brother? Who because he answered I know not, man, am I my brothers keeper, I?" Gen. c. 4, v. 17, 'guero Caignac eçagutu çuen bere emaztea, çegnac conçebitu baitçuen', etc: "Afterwards Cain knew his wife, who because she conceived, etc." Verse 22, 'Eta Tsilla ere erdi içan çen Tubal-caignez, çegna içatu baitçen olha-guiçona', 'And Zillah was delivered of Tubal-Cain, who because he was the smith', etc. This is indeed putting the cart before the horse! The heading of chapter 20 would mean, if Mr. Vinson were right, "Abraham makes his dwelling in Gera where because his wife is carried off by King Abimelech, who after being blamed and punished for his sake by the Lord because he returns Sara intact to Abraham, to whom because he makes great presents and afterwards is healed, etc." A delightful Galimatias indeed! The summary of chap. 35 ends 'çegnac signetssirican hil çela Iossep hartu baitçuen tristécia haundibat', which would mean "who from believing that Joseph is dead because he took upon him a great sadness." Exodus, I. 8, 'çegnac ezpaitçuen eçagutu Iossep' would mean not "which knew not Joseph", but, "who because he knew not Joseph". It is evident that in d'Urte, as in most other authors, this prefix is almost invariably a superfluous affirmative like 'point' after 'ne' in French, to which it corresponds exactly when preceded by the negative 'ez'. It is often very like the auxiliary 'do' in English. Before all things it is necessary to apply common-sense to the interpretation of Baskish which is a strictly logical language, a model of clearness fit for a Lord Chancellor. Basks cannot say in their own tongue any thing as vague as "two hens eggs", or "he has boiled water".

Corrigenda in Editione Oxoniensi.

F. 2, v. 20. read 'hedadura'. The MS has 'hedadura (ren)', but with the syllable 'ren' = 'of', barred out.

F. 5, v. 3. 'hun—(—)vquituco', is 'hura uquituco' correctly in Greatheeds most useful transcript, which was written before the original had had its margins clipped in the binding. It is however clear that the original had 'hura'. Only half of the 'a' is gone, and the word even so does not look much like 'hun' as written elsewhere. The editor should at least have marked the 'n-' as doubtful.

F. 6, v. 18. 'otheac' is not the right rendering of 'chardons'. It should be 'asto-carduac', literally 'ass-thistles'. 'Otheac' means 'furze bushes' and even, in some dialects, 'locusts'. The proper spelling of the word as locusts is, however, 'othiac'. But 'otheac' is generally pronounced in exactly the same way. Baskish 'e' before 'a' is like English 'e' in its sound. 'Larrepote=field-locust' Ex: c. 10. v. 12, etc. shews probably that 'ote' was once 'pote'. Other Baskish words beginning in 'o' have lost an initial 'p'.

F. 6, v. 22. The first 'n' in 'Ianquintssun' ought to have been marked as superfluous and incorrect. The scribe was doubtless thinking of 'jan' which occurs just below.

F. 8, Summary. The 'm' in 'Noeremgoco' should have been branded as a manuscriptal defect. The scribe put 'ra' quite rationally, though not very clearly, in 'Noereragnoco'. It means 'of' or 'belonging-to so far as Noah', i. e. of 'the era before Noah'. In modern writing it would probably be'' Noerañoko'. As d'Urte wrote it, it has three case-endings piled one on the top of the other. So in Gen. c. 48, v. 15, there is 'arterera-gno.'

F. 9, 8, v. 23. The 'c' in 'caürthurican' should be cedillated.

F. 9, v. 12, 'hala. leel' should have been marked as a misprint for 'halaleel'.

F. 9, v. 10 'hoigoi' is a misprint for 'hogoi'. The MS is not to blame.

F. 9, verso v. 27 the 'c' in 'Methuscela' ought to have been in Italic, because it is not cedillated. The same remark applies to that in the second syllable of 'concerba'. The omission of the 'cedille' is either a "fault escaped in the printing", or should have been noted as contrary to the general practice of the writer of the original. D'Urte used both 'ce', 'ci', and 'çe, 'çi', more generally the latter. My intention was to use them throughout in the second edition. It will be seen that d'Urte uses 'z' in some words instead of 'ç', and 'k' in others instead of hard 'c'.

Gen. c. 3, Summary. 'Errescatatcaillearen' ought to have a cedille under the 2nd 'c'. The Oxford editor had the 2nd 'at' marked as wrong. But it is quite in order, as the word comes from Castilian 'rescata'. On p. 100 of the oldest remaining book in Gipuskoan Baskish, the Doctrina Christiana of J. Ochoa de Arin (San Sebastián or Donostian 1713) 'rescatatcea' occurs, meaning 'the rescuing'. In this the 'tcea' is the articulate or determinate form of the ending of the verbal noun or infinitive and

equal to 'tça' in 'errescatatçaillearen' = of the 'rescuer' or 're-
deemer'.

F. 10. v. 2. 'hetaric hartu çiłuztela emaztetçat beretçat' can only
mean "taking them from them for (i. e. to the advantage of) the
very self-same women". The termination 'tçat' can mean "in the
capacity of", "to become"; but the laws of the use of 'bera' leave
no doubt that 'emaztetçat beretçat' is not the right translation here.
'beretçat emaztetçat' might bear the right meaning; but it is not
euphonic and scarcely clear. The real remedy is to read 'bere
emaztetçat' meaning "to be their own wives". The author no
doubt meant 'emaztetçat' to bear the one sense of 'tcat' and
'beretçat' to have the other. But the use of the same termination
with different senses in each of two consecutive words is bad in
any case. If, however, 'beretçat' be placed after 'emaztetçat' the
Bask reader is forced to give to both terminations the self-same
sense, and that makes none. D'Urte means to say "taking to them-
selves to wife", but he really writes "taking for the very wives",
as if, that is, they were already married.

In Gen. c. 28, v. 2. 'hiretçat', 'emaztetçat' is not elegant,
because here also 'tçat' has two different senses. The words were
separated in the edition of 1899, just as in Gen. c. 12. v. 19 we
have "eta enetçat hartu nuen emaztetçat".

F. 11, v. 17. In 'guçiey arimac egiñen diote' the verb 'diote'
is a senseless blunder on the part of the scribe. In the 2nd
edition I put in its place 'diraizteat' = 'I have them . . . to them
O man!', which occurs in St. Lukes Gospel, c. 19. v. 8, in Leiçar-
ragas New Testament of 1571, reprinted, with all its defects and
some new ones, in 1900.

The use of 'egiñen' appears to be justified by 'egin' in c. 14. v.
7, and recalls the phrase 'çintçurrac eguiteco' also; but as it is
not now used in the sense of 'destroy' (vulgar 'do for'), and does
not bear that meaning in the word-books, it were better to take
it in both places as a slip of the pen for 'desegiñen' and 'desegin'
respectively.

F. 13, in the summary the second 'i' in 'ilkitçera' is unduly
loaded with two accents. The original is 'ilkhîtçera', with ' above
a circumflex on the second 'i'. Elsewhere also d'Urte has charged
the letter 'i' with both dot and accent, e. g. f. 107, vo, v. 23,
'ihurtçiriac', which is quite bad enough, especially as the same
word occurs on the next page without any accent.

F. 14, v. 13. 'Dadillala' is not marked as having one 'l' too
many in the middle.

F. 14, v°. v. 19 'besti' is not marked. It should, of course, be 'bestia', in which the 'a' is etymological and not the article.

F. 14, v°, v. 21. The MS has 'gaztarassunetic'. The Oxford edition doubles the 'r'. Mine, of 1899 has 'gaztartassunetic;' but 'gaztetassunetic' would be more usual.

F. 16, v°, in the Summary one reads 'Iaphethen', but thrice in the chapter 'Iaphethten'. One or the other of these forms should have been marked as a blunder. The latter of course is wrong.

F. 19, v°, v. 29. The sense of the original is that the name of Nacors wife was Milcah, and that she was the daughter of Haran, who was the father of herself and Iiscar. The MS presents us with 'father' in apposition not with Haran (as it seems in English), but with Milcah, which makes nonsense. We see elsewhere that d'Urte was not good at pedigrees. All becomes clear if we read "alaba Haran baitçen Milcaren eta Iiscaren aita": making a new clause at the end, and inserting "Haran was father of Milcah and Iscar".

F. 23, v. 1. 'Araioc' is an evident mistake for 'Arioc' which occurs in v. 9. Calvin wrote 'Arioch'.

F. 23, v°, v. 8. 'bere' after 'çuten' is needlessly repeated, but not noted as a 'lapsus calami'.

F. 24, v. 18. Read 'Melkisedec'. The MS has 'Melkisede' as if 'Melkisedec' were not the proper name, but the active nominative of 'Melkisede'. Compare d'Urtes misusing of 'Abimelec'. The active case of 'Melkisedec' would, of course, be 'Melkisedekek'. Yet d'Urte has correctly put 'Melkissedeki' as the dative, c. 14, sum: 18. Harismendi has, p. 148 'Melchisedec handiaren' = 'of the great Melkisedec'.

F. 26, v. 7. After 'Eternalaren' (= 'of the Eternal') the word 'Aingueruac' has been omitted, both in the writing and in the printing, yet no note on it repairs the omission.

F. 26, v°. 16. The omission of 'a' before the first 'e' in 'Ismelez' has also escaped censure. It is likewise a manuscriptal shortcoming.

F. 28, v. 18. Should not the 2nd 'o' in 'oçhola' (sic MS) have been marked for a mistake for 'a'?

F. 29, v°, v. 14. 'gorderiçacóric?' should be marked as a miswriting of 'gordericacóric. The edition of 1899 is also to blame. Some of its defects I had certainly marked on the proof.

F. 29, v°, v. 17. The word "diot' has been omitted in the MS before 'Abrahani'. The 1st edition does not restaur it.

F. 31, v°, v. 14.   On d'Urtes principles the 'c' in 'çela' should be 'ç'.

F. 31, v°, v. 17.   The final letter of 'salbac' should have been marked as superfluous.   The MS is to blame.   It was perhaps meant for 'e' the initial of 'eçac' instead of 'çac' the next word. But 'çac' is common in the book.   The word 'salba' occurs correctly thrice on this page.

F. 31, v°, v. 18.   'ciote' is the printers fault.   The MS has 'çioten', correctly.

F. 33, v. 6.   'ez' after 'aüt' should be left out.   D'Urte had at first written 'guardatu ere aüt ez bekhatu eguign ezteçaántçat'. Then in altering it he left the 'ez' where it is; striking out only 'gn ezteçaántçat'.   He probably meant at first to put 'ezteçaánt-çat bekhatu eguign'.

F. 34.   The foot-note should be 'egunen', not 'egunetaco'. The same misuse of the word 'urthe' = 'year' for 'egun' = 'day' occurs on f. 27. verso.

F. 35, v. 25.   'Abimele' should be 'Abimelec'.   But 'Abime-lequec' is required in c. 20 vv. 9, 10; in c. 21, vv. 26 and 29, and in all other places where the name occurs as nominative to an active or transitive verb.   We find d'Urte using 'Abimelec' rightly as the passive nominative in c. 21, v. 22 and v. 32, where it governs 'çen' = 'was'.   D'Urte observes the rules for other cases correctly as regards this name, e. g. G. c. 20, v. 3 and c. 21, v. 27, 'Abimelequi'; except c. 20, v. 18, where 'Abimelequen' would be right instead of 'Abimelen' as the MS gives.   It is right in c. 21, v. 25.   The Oxford edition did not check these errors.   My own edition is also at fault.

In c. 20, v. 17 and c. 21, v. 25, 'Abimelec' is right as an accusa-tive.   The word follows of course the same rules as 'Isaac' for its declension.   F. 41, vo, v. 67 and elsewhere the MS has 'Isaaquec' rightly as the nominative governing 'çuen'.   When he comes to c. 26, d'Urte is awake again, and writes 'Abimlecquec' or 'Abimelequec' where it is needed.

F. 36, v. 5.   'dugu' implies that 'astoa' (= 'the ass') is to be worshipped!   That is the last object mentioned.   Basks cannot say "we will adore".   They must say "we will adore 'it' or 'them'".   So the word Eternala, rendering *l'Éternel*, must be added.   One remarks in other places a tendency on the part of d'Urte to omit the equivalent of words which happen to be in Italic in the French.

F. 36, v. 12. 'eztiocacala' ought to have been marked as a misprint of 'eztioçacala'. The MS is guilty.

F. 38, v°, v. 12. The omission of 'graçiazco bat' after 'incuntru', to render 'une heureuse', has not been marked.

F. 39, v. 15. The grammar does not quite correspond with the genealogy given above in c. 22, vv. 20-24. 'Emaztearena' should be 'emaztearen semearena'; and 'anaiarena' should be 'anaiaren semearena'. It is all right in v. 24, just below.

F. 39, v°, v. 28. Read ' goan çen' not 'goäcen'. The MS is wrong.

F, 42, v. 9. The MS rightly has 'eta' not 'et'.

F. 42, v°, v. 20. 'agé de quarante ans' should be 'berrogoy urtheren'; but Mr. Thomas put only 'berrogoyen' as a correction of the obvious error 'laurhogoÿen' which means 'of eighty'. In all other places where a persons age is recorded, d'Urte expresses the word 'years' as Calvin did in the French.

F. 43, v. 11. 'Dattes' has been translated 'pignu-fruituac' = 'pine-fruits'. D'Urte might as well have written 'pig-nuts'. Larramendi has 'datila' for 'el datil'. The plural is 'datilac'.

F. 43, v°, v. 1. 'Gerara should be 'Gerarera'. The MS is wrong here. In v. 6 it is 'Geraren' rightly, in the locative case.

F. 43, v°, v. 3. For 'hiri ondoreari' read 'hire ondoreari'. The MS is to blame, and the edition for not marking the mistake.

F. 44, v°, v. 18. 'çituen', though needlessly repeated in the MS, is not marked as a mistake.

F. 46, v. 7. The last letter in 'dietçaquidaco' should have been marked as superfluous. M. J. Vinson omits it in his Appendix. The MS is at fault.

F. 46, v. 11. For 'illetts' read 'illetssua'. The MS is correct. In v. 29, 'aitçignenean ought to be 'aitcignean'. The scribe, having put 'aitçigne'= at the end of a line, began the next with = 'nean' instead of = 'an'. In v. 46, the MS has 'Rebecac'. Read 'Rebeccac'.

F. 48, v°, v. 2, 'hartçat' should be 'har tçac'. The scribe thought of the 't' in the next word 'hiretçat', which he has separated by a comma from 'emaztetçat' thereby diminishing the awkwardness of such a collocation. This was overlooked in the printing.

F. 48, v°, v. 4. 'hiri' = 'town', (perhaps Semitic in origin, if not a phonetic variety of 'huri', 'uri') seems to be a mistake for 'herri' = 'contry', 'land'. This can be used for 'hiri', but not 'hiri' for 'herri'.

F. 48, v°, v. 7.   Instead of 'çitue - ('n,') read ' çituela ', as the word is on the same footing as 'çuela' in the preceding verse, and 'çela' just after it.   In the MS it is 'citue'= at the end of a line.   So it is clear that the scribe meant to begin the next with = 'la'.

F. 49, v°, v. 3.   The MS has rightly 'han', not 'hau'.

F. 50, v°, v. 17 and f. 59, v. 13.   'mimbera' should be plural 'mimberac' as a predicative epithet, cf. f. 71, vo, v. 7 'triste çiren'.

F. 53, v. 33.   'aitçignean a mistake for 'aiçenean', may be accounted for by the preceding 'aitçignera' three lines above.   But in any case it is clumsy here, and another point in favour of the dictation theory.

F. 54, Summary.   The printer put two dots and an accent on the 2nd 'i' in 'ichillican'.   The original is 'ichíllican,' or, possibly 'ichíllican' with one dot and an accent over this 'i'.

F. 54, v°, v. 13.   'arotan' should be 'hinarotan'.   This mistake coming after 'eguign' = 'egiñ' is also probably to be explained as the result of dictation by d'Urte.

F. 55, v°, v. 37.   The MS has 'guc', but it should be 'gu'.   In v. 12 the misprint in 'altçhac' is wrongly noted.   The 'c' final should be suppressed, not cedillated.

F. 56, v°, sum: read 'hirriscuaren'.   The MS wrongly divides the word.

F. 56, v°, v. 53. 'beçate' should be 'beça'.   'Iaincóëc as plural is heretical: but the French is 'les dieux'.

F. 58, v. 29.   'Iabec' in the MS should be 'Iacobec'.   The edition marks it.

F. 59, v. 16.   'Sehirrat' should be 'Sehirrerat'.   In c. 33, v. 14 it is 'Sehirrera'.   Cf. G. c. 25, v. 18 'Assurera '.

F. 60, v°, line 1.   Read 'gucietaric', not 'gucietarie'.   The MS is clear and right.

F. 61, v°, v. 4.   Instead of 'guçiuc', read 'guçiac' as the MS has it.

F. 62, v°, v. 9.   'ete' ought to marked as a mistake for 'eta'.   The MS is innocent.

F. 63, 1. 1.   add 'ez' as the termination of 'Rehuel'.   The MS is wrong.

F. 65, v. 2.   The words 'haren aitaren emazteac' = 'his fathers wives', are, to say the least, loosely placed.   The last makes no grammatical sense from an Heuskarian point of view.   It might be either accusative or nominative.   It should be followed by

cirenen haürren artean = *among the children of those who were his fathers wives,* in Italic type. Here the author thought, as too many modern Bask writers do, in 'Erdara' the destructive foe of 'Heuskara'.

F. 65, v. 8. 'baldim' appears to be superfluous.

F. 69, v°, v. 20 and F. 40, v. 3. Why is 'cartçela' marked as if its initial were wrong? It is merely Castilian 'carcel' with the Baskish 'a' = 'the' post-positive. (Note 'ce' = 'tce'.)

F. 70, v°, v. 6. Is 'triste' a verbable radical = 'to be sad'? If not, ought not 'tristeac' to be used? cf. 'mimbera' c. 33, v. 13.

F. 70, v°, v. 14, etc: 'gógara' for gógora occurs in other books, e. g. p. 227 of that of Harismendi.

F. 70, v. 23. 'revoioit' is translated 'egortçen as if it were 'renvoioit'. The Oxford edition suggests no remedy, though it marks the word. 'Ikertcen' is the right word. Deafness and dictation again suggest themselves.

F. 71, v°. In the Summary the MS omits the 'cedilla' under the first 'c' in 'ethorquiçuneco', but there is no note on it.

F. 72. v. 8. 'Ejiptu' is a mistake for 'Egiptuco'. The hyphen at the end shews that the scribe meant to add 'co', for there is no hyphen before 'majiciano', the first word of the next line, as, according to the rule of the MS, there would have been if 'Ejiptu' had been meant to be joined onto it.

F. 76, v°, v. 38 and F. 80, vo, v. 31. 'dolorerequign' is wrongly marked as containing a misprint. 'Dolore' is the stem: and 'requiñ' is 'with'. 'Dolore' occurs for instance on pp, 161, 197 and 217 of the 'Dotrina Christiana' of E. Materre.

F. 79, v°, v. 5 . . . . 'ceña eguiazki eçagutuco baitic?' does not translate '& par laquelle trés-assûrément il devinera?' but "and which he will truly recognise". In this verse 'non' translates 'dans laquelle' = 'no(r)n'. The ordinary word for 'deviner', 'asmatze', occurs G. c. 44, v. 15.

F. 79, v. 34. 'bonachira', marked as a slip of the pen for 'bonachera', which Harismendi has on p. 128, may be a reminiscence of the English 'good cheer' which d'Urte enjoyed in his exile before he lost his pension, or the Basks may have taken it from old French 'chiere'. In the same way his use of 'irrin lore' = 'flower' (of) 'flour' points to his work having been written in England.

F. 81, v. 34. After 'guertha' = at the end of a line the scribe must have meant to add not 'tçen', as Mr. Thomas did; but 'tceco', the futural ending, for the French has 'qui adviendra'.

F. 82, v. 16. 'çer', the interrogative pronoun has not been marked. It is an evident manuscriptal error for 'ceña', the relative pronoun.

F. 84, v. 20. 'Potipherath' ought to have been marked as a mis-writing of 'Potipherah'.

F. 87, v°, v. 10. The second 'c' in 'baitçeçáquen' has not been marked. It should be 'ç'.

F. 88, v°. In the Summary 'Iacobec' is a misprint for the possessive case 'Iacoben' = 'of Jacob'. The MS is right here.

F. 91, v°, v. 10. For 'Adaco', as the MS has it, read 'Atadco', as in v. 11.

F. 92, v°, v. 1. The last two letters of 'Israelenen' should have been bracketed for omission. The manuscript is wrong here.

F. 93, v°, v. 16. The MS rightly has ditûtçuen.

F. 94, v. 4. Some word has been omitted after 'eguignen' in the MS.

F. 95, v°, 1. 3. 'erratten' ought to be 'erraten'. The MS is not erratic in this place.

F. 100. In the note read 'pipa' rather than 'ondoa'. Compare Gen. c. 14, v. 22.

F. 101, v°, v. 16 and 18. 'Kehath' is no mistake, for it is spelt so in Calvins French. Cf. Gen. 46, v. 11 where d'Urte himself hesitated and put both 'Kohath' and 'Kehath'.

Folio 102, v. 33. No mark has been put to shew that the last four letters of 'arrebarena' have no business to be there. 'Arreba' means 'the sister' (in respect of a brother). Elisçebah was sister of Nahasson. But 'arrebarena' would mean "the (daughter) of the sister", as if she were, on the contrary, his niece. D'Urte, as we have already seen, was not cleverer at genealogical grammar than at botanical names.

Folio 107, v. 10. The copulative termination of 'Dakharzquetenéquign' is surprising and quite wrong. The construction with 'billhatu' in the verse before being the simple nominative as predicate. He uses the copulative ending again quite wrongly, as is noted on f. 110, v. 18 of the Oxford edition, in Exodos c. 10, v. 18. 'Billhatu' = 'turned into'.

F. 108, v. 29. The initial letter of 'tituc' ought as much to be marked as it is in verse 9 of f. 104 vo, as a mistake for 'd'. It is just possibly a dialectal peculiarity. But one gets 'gueldituco dituc' on f. 105.

F. 108, v°, the note is incorrect. The word left unrepresented

by d'Urte is 'l'épeautre' in Calvins French. It would be 'la espelta' in Castilian, 'the spelt' in English. Larramendi in his Dictionary renders it by 'gari mota bat' which merely signifies 'a kind of grain' rightly adding "Lat. Spelta". One may safely suggest that the word 'escanda' will serve very well, as it is easier for a Bask to pronounce, and occurs in the old Castilian version. The Greek has ὄλυρα which may be of the same origin as Baskish 'oloa' = 'oats'. An 'r' between two vowels frequently falls out in the spoken Baskish, especially in the Souletin dialect.

F. 109, v. 7. The last clause in this verse is not rightly translated.

F. 112, v. 6. He translates l'égorgera' (= 'he will cut its throat') by 'larrutuco dic' which means 'l'écorchera'. Duvoisin uses the vague term 'hilen' = 'shall kill it'. Larramendi in his Dictionary translates 'degollar' by words compounded of 'throat' or 'neck' and 'cut'. Dictation again!

F. 113, v°, v. 23. 'çuen' is needlessly repeated in the MS before 'etchétan'. This blunder is not indicated.

F. 114, v°, v. 44. In 'ianengo' the double future ending is certainly a mistake in the MS. In the following and preceding verses 'ianen', which would suffice, is used; and so, I believe, everywhere else if 'manger' occurs in the future tense. The scribes eye caught 'içango' which occurs twice in the same verse.

F. 116. In the note read 'dituc' and not 'direla'.

F. 117, v°, v. 11. The first 'c' in 'baicaituc' is no mistake, as the editor supposed. It is the 'g' of 'gaituc' with the ordinary mutation after the prefix, or possibly the old form of 'gaituc' only kept up when the prefix serves as a bulwark. Hard 'c' in Bask tends to turn into 'g'.

F. 117, v°, v. 13. Of course 'ditut' and 'çuenac' form but a single word. So are 'baniat' and 'horc' on f. 124, vo, v. 6. The scribe has put asunder many things that should be joined together.

F. 123, v°, v. 5. 'Eta har tçac hire escuan çhigor: hartaz ibaia jo duäna, eta athor adi' is not a correct translation of: '& prens en ta main la verge, dont tu frapas la fleuve, & marche'. In the original the scribe put 'chigorrá' and then barred out the 'ra' = 'the' after a noun ending in 'r'. When he wrote 'çhigorrá' = 'the rod' he meant no doubt to go on with a relative clause beginning 'çeñaz' = 'with the which' and to put 'duc' or 'duan' instead of 'duana'. But he got into a muddle over it, and has given us both the instrumental case of a demonstrative pronoun

which one does not want, 'hartaz', and a relative verb declined in the accusative 'duäna', and the result is untranslatable, although one can guess at the meaning. If 'duana' is correct, 'hartaz' is needless. The relative 'dont' is expressed by the 'n' in 'duäna' which is the relatival articulated form of 'duc', in which 'äna' means 'the (rod) with which'. The word is really the same as 'duäna' in c. 18, v. 17. The precise prepositional quality attached to the relative 'n' depends on the context of course. It belongs to both genders, to singular and plural, and to all cases. It is a most beautiful and catholic hinge-letter. Probably no language has a more convenient or effectual one. It may be compared to a 'point' on the railway for guiding a train off one road on to another. This is not the only proof that d'Urte did not understand the use of the relative pronoun 'n' as a verbal ending. There is for instance Ex: 18, v. 20. 'nondic goan direna' = 'par laquelle ils doivent marcher', where of course the article 'a' in 'direna' is quite superfluous and wrong, if 'nondic' be kept. The latter is quite right if followed by an unarticulated 'diren' as a simple conjunctive. 'Nondic' can mean either 'whence' 'from where' 'from ... in which', or, as in this place, 'by' or 'through which'. Here its sense is fully expressed in the 'n' of 'direna. He was not, however, the only author who did not understand the capabilities of the relative pronoun 'n'. We see its misuse in the words 'deusenari' (for 'deusenak'), 'jacanari' (for 'jacana'), in the Refranes y Sentencias printed at Pamplona in 1596 and in Geneva in 1896, a most important document.

Moreover Voltoire in his 'Trésor' has 'cein sor baikeituzuene-gatik', where 'cein' is superfluous with the 'n' of 'keituzuen'.

F. 124, v°, v. 1. The MS reads correctly 'Iethro', not 'Iethroc' the word being in the same grammatical relation to 'aitaguign-harrauac' and 'çuen' as in verse 12 on the next side. This serves to shew that 'Saraic' in c. 16, v. 1, should be 'Sarai', though the scribe perhaps took 'bada' as a break in the four words which compose the nominative of 'etçioën'. Yet in G. c. 20, v. 2 'Abimelec bada Gerarco Erregeac' is an exactly similar case, and there 'Abimelec' is passive.

F. 126, v°, v. 15. Instead of 'ganic' read 'ganat'. This deserved a foot-note as much as any of d'Urtes laughable blunders. Also on f. 118, v. 20, we have 'hurbildu bertceaganic' = 'near the other'. It must, however, be said that the Baskish idiom for 'near to' is 'near from', as in the Romance tongues, e. g. in French

'se rapprocher de la ville'. But d'Urte elsewhere uses 'hurbill' with 'gana' or 'ganat' generally, e. g. G. c. 33, v. 3. E. Materre, p. 281, has 'Hurbil çaite othoi ene arimara', i. e. 'approach Thou unto my soul', using 'ra' the directive case ending.

F. 128. In the note, instead of 'kharrac' read 'çhiçhmiçhtac', which occurs in c. 19, v. 16. The proper sense of 'kharra' is seen in 'kharretan', the locative case plural, Ex: c. 3, v. 2.

F. 128, v°, v. 23. The MS has 'Iaincoric' all right, at the end.

F. 130, v°, v. 35. The MS clearly gives 'erditican'. 'Orditican' is quite out of order.

p. 134, suppress 'afin'. p. 143, read 'citiztean'. p. 150, l. 15, read 'ait', not 'aie'. p. 162, after "Londres", 1870 insert "& 1876". After 1881 insert "London". To the list of Biblical translations one must also add the edition of the gospels of St. John and St. Luke published in 1884 by the Trinitarian Bible Society. They were printed from the plates already used by the British and Forane Bible Society, and issued in a new cover. M. J. Vinson omitted them in his valuable 'Bibliographie Basque' of 1891.

THE APOLOGY OF THE CRITIC.

I met the Revd. Llewelyn Thomas in the Library of Bayonne, B. P., in the summer of 1892, while he was chaplain to the Anglican Community in Biarritz; and he told me that he was learning Heuskara. So I informed him of the d'Urte manuscripts, and advised him to persuade the Delegates of the Clarendon Press to publish them, and produce the first Baskish book ever printed in Oxford. My suggestion bore good fruit, and our edition[1] appeared on the first of June, 1894; consisting, as I was informed by Mr. C. E. Doble, of five hundred copies. Nine months later I wrote a criticism on it, the draught of which Mr. Thomas himself forwarded for publication to The Academy. But, fortunately, its crudities escaped publicity, and it has developed into the present less imperfect essay, in which I can embody the results of my collation of the original manuscripts, realised first

---

[1] Some of its defects were removed in my own edition of the Genesis (Etórkia.), published on the 21st of February 1899 by the Trinitarian Bible Society, 25 New Oxford Street, London, W. C. In this the spelling was partially modernised. On p. 104, v. 9 the correction, erraten cioela, must be added to the list, and ciaitáan.

for two hours on the afternoon of the 25th of September last at Shirburn Castle, and then at leisure during the whole of the following month in the Bodleian Library, where Lady Maccles-field very graciously caused them to be deposited on loan under the care of Mr. E. W. B. Nicholson. No review of the book having yet appeared in the English Language, I venture, after paying attention to Baskology for fifteen years, to submit my own to the notice of the curious, hoping that it will tempt them to learn Baskish, and be clear to them, if they have not begun. Mr. Thomas shewed great skill upon the whole in his editorial work. His plan was to reproduce the MS leaf by leaf, without amendment. He had learned a good deal of Baskish in a few months; but not quite enough to detect all the beams and motes in d'Urtes eye, or to avoid some blemishes of which the original is, as I always hoped, guiltless. I believe that I marked some of these in the proofing.

Oxford, All Hallows Day, 1901.   EDWARD SPENCER DODGSON.

IV.—EPICUREA.

The letter of Epicurus to Herodotus commences with an introductory paragraph, designed to define the class of readers for whom this Epicurean epitome was prepared. Thereupon the author turns to his theme with the following words: "First, then, one should apprehend that which underlies the words [that is, the sensations on occasion of which we utter, or first uttered, the words], in order that we may have something to which to refer, as to a court of last appeal, opinions, questions, and difficulties, so that, as we construct our argument, every thing may not run on unadjudicated *ad infinitum*, and we thus have but empty words. For, in the case of every word, we must look to its first intention, and there rest the case without requiring further demonstration, if we are to have something to which we can appeal in cases of question, difficulty and opinion."

Then follows a sentence that still wants explanation, § 38: εἴτε κατὰ τὰς αἰσθήσεις δεῖ πάντα τηρεῖν καὶ ἁπλῶς τὰς παρούσας ἐπιβολὰς εἴτε διανοίας εἴ θ' ὅτου δή ποτε τῶν κριτηρίων, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα πάθη, ὅπως ἂν καὶ τὸ προσμένον καὶ τὸ ἄδηλον ἔχωμεν οἷς σημειωσόμεθα. I infer from Usener's Epicurea that this is the reading of the MSS upon which he relies for the text. But πάντα before τηρεῖν is omitted in F, one of the best MSS. Bruns, Lucrez-Studien, p. 32, n. 1, reports the MSS as reading εἴτε τὰς αἰσθήσεις, omitting κατά, which is important, if true.

The passage, as it stands, appears to yield no intelligible sense, although Cobet and Hirzel, Untersuchungen, I 125, retain it essentially in this form. Since so much of the doctrine of Epicurus is involved in the understanding of these words, it will be necessary to discuss them at considerable length. Such an examination is the more demanded because even Giussani, in his Lucretius, has hardly advanced the solution of the question. Usener adopts the MSS reading, only substituting ἔπειτα for the first εἴτε, to obtain an adverb answering to πρῶτον μέν. Unfortunately Usener, like Hirzel, gives no hint as to the construction. Gassendi, besides reading εἴτα for the first εἴτε, introduced κατά

13

before τὰς παρούσας ἐπιβολάς and τὰ ὑπάρχοντα πάθη, holding αἰσθήσεις, ἐπιβολάς and πάθη to be like elements in the sentence. Giussani, Lucretius I p. 177, n. 1, demands the insertion of κατά in the latter place, but not in the former, asserting that the ἐπιβολαί are not κριτήρια in the same sense as αἰσθήσεις and πάθη.

We shall presently return to this assertion. For the present it will suffice to note that ἐπιβολάς and πάθη are conceived of as like elements of the sentence, as is made evident by the addition of παρούσας and ὑπάρχοντα. These terms are clearly synonymous.[1] We may next consider ἁπλῶς. The word here means 'in short', implying partial similarity and contrast with something that preceded. The choice lies between αἰσθήσεις and πάντα, and the former only will answer. Besides, as Giussani also has seen, in so fundamental a statement of the κριτήρια, πάθη at least must be parallel in construction to αἰσθήσεις. But we have already seen that παρούσας and ὑπάρχοντα place ἐπιβολάς and πάθη in the same construction. Hence αἰσθήσεις, ἐπιβολάς and πάθη belong inseparably together.

We would thus be led to look with favor upon the suggestion of Gassendi that we insert κατά before both τὰς παρούσας ἐπιβολάς and τὰ ὑπάρχοντα πάθη. The loss of κατά in the latter place could readily be explained, as it would follow καί, with which it is often confounded. Its omission in the earlier place would cause more difficulty. But it is possible that there may be a better solution. Even a hasty glance at the context will show that the sentence under discussion was conceived by its author as a close parallel to the one just preceding. There we have ἀνάγκη γὰρ τὸ πρῶτον ἐννόημα καθ' ἕκαστον φθόγγον βλέπεσθαι ... while in our sentence we have τηρεῖν which has much the same meaning as βλέπεσθαι.[2] Furthermore the thought of the two sentences is as nearly as possible parallel. Now, if we could render τηρεῖν with 'test,' or 'examine,' the text of Gassendi might stand; for then κατὰ τὰς αἰσθήσεις would properly mean 'by reference to the sensations,' a meaning quite consistent with the sentence itself and with sub-

---

[1] Cp. § 82: ὅθεν τοῖς πάθεσι προσεκτέον τοῖς παροῦσι καὶ ταῖς αἰσθήσεσι .. καὶ πάσῃ τῇ παρούσῃ καθ' ἕκαστον τῶν κριτηρίων ἐναργείᾳ. The entire passage affords a striking parallel to § 38 and to § 147, to be considered later. Note also that προσεκτέον here = τηρητέον, for which see τηρεῖν in § 38.

[2] For Epicurus' usage, cp. § 77: ἀλλὰ πᾶν τὸ σέμνωμα τηρεῖν, κατὰ πάντα ὀνόματα φερόμενον ἐπὶ τὰς τοιαύτας ἐννοίας, and in the letter to Pythocles, § 88: τὸ μέντοι φάντασμα (= ἐνάργημα) ἑκάστου τηρητέον.

sequent references to it.[1] But the verb will not bear this interpretation. It would seem, therefore, that the phrase cannot be correct, since no other tenable explanation can be given of κατά.

I would therefore omit both κατά and πάντα and read: ἔπειτα τὰς αἰσθήσεις δεῖ τηρεῖν καὶ ἁπλῶς τὰς παρούσας ἐπιβολὰς εἴ τε διανοίας εἴ θ' ὅτου δή ποτε τῶν κριτηρίων, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα πάθη, ὅπως ἂν καὶ τὸ προσμένον καὶ τὸ ἄδηλον ἔχωμεν οἷς σημειωσόμεθα. "Next, we must look strictly to the sense-impressions, and, in short, to the present perception, be it of the understanding, be it of whatever cognitive faculty, and in like manner to the present pleasure-pains, in order that we may have something by means of which we may infer both that which still awaits confirmation by the senses and that which is not accessible to sense-perception."

Now, regarding the words thus rejected, it will be recalled that πάντα is not found in F, and that, according to Bruns the MSS omit κατά. It is well, however, to attach little weight to these considerations. The foregoing discussion has shown that Usener's text is impossible, and the solution of the problem here given is certainly simpler than Gassendi's. Moreover κατὰ and πάντα probably belong together. It may be that Epicurus used the words to point the contrast between the two statements, the appeal, in the latter, to αἰσθήσεις, ἐπιβολαί, and πάθη being universal —κατὰ πάντα—whereas we resort to the first intention only καθ' ἕκαστον φθόγγον. If κατά was omitted and set in the margin, it would be easy to account for its insertion at the wrong point.[2] It may be, on the other hand, that the phrase was added by a reader, to mark the above-mentioned contrast.

It remains for us to consider the objection of Giussani that the ἐπιβολαί did not belong to the κριτήρια. I shall soon discuss in another connection the entire subject of the Epicurean κριτήρια, and hence may here touch lightly upon it. The phrase φανταστικὴ ἐπιβολή, occurring in §§ 50, 51, shows that the ἐπιβολή was a function of the φαντασία = αἴσθησις (cp. φανταστόν = αἰσθητόν). But the expression, in § 38, ἐπιβολὰς εἴ τε διανοίας εἴ θ' ὅτου δή ποτε τῶν κριτηρίων

---

[1] Cp. § 39: αὐτὴ ἡ αἴσθησις ἐπὶ πάντων μαρτυρεῖ, καθ' ἣν ἀναγκαῖον τὸ ἄδηλον τῷ λογισμῷ τεκμαίρεσθαι, ὥσπερ προεῖπον, referring to the preceding §. See also § 68: ἀνάγων τις ἐπὶ τὰ πάθη καὶ τὰς αἰσθήσεις, μνημονεύων τῶν ἐν ἀρχῇ ῥηθέντων.

[2] The common use of κατά in reference to the κριτήρια, as in § 39, and especially in the Κύριαι Δόξαι, § 147, which passage from the 'Articles' was of course familiar to every Epicurean, may well have led to the confusion, since, if κατά was taken with αἰσθήσεις, πάντα would naturally assume the place of the wanting object of τηρεῖν.

further proves that this function was exercised by an indefinite
number of κριτήρια. In addition to αἰσθήσεις and πάθη the Epicureans
commonly included in their number also the προλήψεις.[1] The
definition[2] of πρόληψις proves that it was a form of ἐπιβολή, and
indeed it seems but natural to conclude that by the ἐπιβολαὶ τῆς
διανοίας Epicurus meant chiefly the προλήψεις.[3] I shall pass over
the technical φανταστικὴ ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας which the Epicureans,
if not Epicurus, accounted one of the κριτήρια, because a discussion
of it would lead us too far afield. One thing is beyond dispute:
Epicurus himself spoke in the most general terms[4] of κριτήρια,
and the definite formulation of three or four canonical κριτήρια
is one of the first fruits of the Epicurean scholasticism to which
we owe many of our misconceptions of the founder of the school.
We may thus dismiss the objection raised by Giussani.

There is a second passage, in § 41, that requires emendation:
ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἄπειρόν ἐστι. τὸ γὰρ πεπερασμένον ἄκρον ἔχει· τὸ δὲ
ἄκρον παρ' ἕτερόν τι θεωρεῖται. ὥστε οὐκ ἔχον ἄκρον πέρας οὐκ ἔχει· πέρας
δὲ οὐκ ἔχον ἄπειρον ἂν εἴη καὶ οὐ πεπερασμένον. "The universe is in-
finite; for that which is limited has an outermost part. But the
outermost part is viewed relatively to something else. Therefore,
not having an outermost part, it has not a limit; and not having
a limit, it is infinite and not limited."

On reading these words attentively, one will detect in the third
clause a weakness in the argument. It is not, strictly speaking,
the outermost part of an object that is viewed relatively to some-
thing else; for the outermost part is viewed relatively to the other
parts of the same object. It is rather *that which has an outermost*

---

[1] Cp. Diog. Laert. X 31.

[2] Clem. Alex., Strom. II 4, p. 157 Sylb., apparently quoting Epicurus, says;
πρόληψιν δὲ ἀποδίδωσιν ἐ π ι β ο λ ὴ ν ἐπί τι ἐναργὲς καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐναργῆ τοῦ πράγματος
ἐπίνοιαν. Cp. Philodemus (Sudh. vol. II, p. 40): ὀψ[ό]μεθα γάρ, ἂν ἐπιβάλλ[ω]
με[ν], ἃ μὲν καλοῦσιν ἐνθυμήματα, where ἐπιβάλλειν = animum advertere.

[3] Cp. Diog. Laert. X 62: ἐπεὶ τό γε θεωρούμενον πᾶν ἢ κατ' ἐπιβολὴν λαμ-
βανόμενον τῇ διανοίᾳ ἀληθές ἐστιν. Here τὸ θεωρούμενον refers to the αἰσθήσεις,
and τὸ κατ' ἐπιβολὴν λαμβανόμενον τῇ διανοίᾳ would most naturally be taken as
depending upon the προλήψεις.

[4] In addition to the phrase in § 38 now under consideration, compare the
sweeping expression in the Κύριαι Δόξαι, § 147: τὴν αἴσθησιν καὶ τὰ πάθη καὶ
π ᾶ σ α ν φανταστικὴν ἐπιβολὴν τῆς διανοίας. In the letter to Herodotus, § 82,
he says: ὅθεν τοῖς πάθεσι προσεκτέον τοῖς παροῦσι καὶ ταῖς αἰσθήσεσι . . . καὶ π ά σ ῃ
τῇ παρούσῃ κ α θ' ἕ κ α σ τ ο ν τ ῶ ν κ ρ ι τ η ρ ί ω ν ἐναργέᾳ. These phrases show
that Brieger is wrong in omitting as spurious the words εἴτε διανοίας εἴθ . . . τῶν
κριτηρίων.

part that is viewed relatively to something else from which it is distinguished and by which it is limited. We should, therefore, have expected τὸ δὲ ἄκρον ἔχον παρ' ἕτερόν τι θεωρεῖται. This correction seemed to me so self-evident that I added ἔχον in the margin of my text before I observed that Cicero, de Div. II. 50, 103, clearly had before him the correct reading, which he renders exactly: Quod autem habet extremum, id cernitur ex alio extrinsecus.

In § 43 editors of Diog. Laert. have rightly set apart the following passage as a scholion: οὐδὲ γάρ φησιν ἐνδοτέρω εἰς ἄπειρον τὴν τομὴν τυγχάνειν, λήγειν δέ, ἐπειδὴ αἱ ποιότητες μεταβάλλονται, εἰ μέλλει τις μὴ καὶ τοῖς μεγέθεσιν ἁπλῶς εἰς ἄπειρον αὐτὰς ἐκβάλλειν. "And he says farther on that the division of matter does not proceed *ad infinitum*, but that it comes to an end, *since qualities change*, unless one is to carry them [surely not the qualities, but the atoms, are meant] to infinity in point of magnitude as well." Here the clause ἐπειδὴ αἱ ποιότητες μεταβάλλονται not only seriously disturbs the construction, but will prove on examination, I think, to have no relevancy to the argument of the scholion. It seems to be clearly a foreign element intruded by mistake. If one disregards the clause, the remainder of the sentence proceeds directly to the point which is later developed in §§ 56 foll. But there is not the remotest reference in that connection to change of quality as conditioning the argument. And, indeed, it is not easy to see how qualitative change should be affected by the infinite divisibility of matter. In any case infinite divisibility would seem rather to favor such change than to prevent it.

A glance at the connection suggests an explanation of the intrusion of the clause. The scholion was written in the margin to support the assertion ταῖς δὲ διαφοραῖς < *sc.* αἱ ἄτομοι > οὐχ ἁπλῶς ἄπειροι ἀλλὰ μόνον ἀπερίληπτοι. To this scholion, then, as seems to me highly probable, someone added, as an independent argument, a reference to the problem of qualitative change. Anaxagoras had believed in the infinite divisibility of matter and also in the existence of the homoeomeries. He accounted for qualitative change—always only in the mass—by admixture and by the prominence in the bulk of this or that element or set of elements. The Epicureans, however, attributing as they did great efficacy to change in order, position, etc., and having no distinct unchanging qualities to neutralize, required for their purposes far less variety in the elements themselves.

Lucretius II 578 ff. reports an argument which Epicurus doubtless used in this connection. The reason he assigns for the finitude of atomic shapes is that, unless the theory is to contradict the senses by making the atom large enough to be seen, its number of *partes minimae* must be limited and hence the possible arrangements of them are of course finite. The scholion on the τομὴ εἰς ἄπειρον is closely akin to this argument. Lucretius II 500 ff. adduces a second: If the variety of atomic forms were infinite, qualities (which depend upon them) would not be found to keep within fixed limits. There would always be something better than the best, something worse than the worst. Giussani, on Lucretius I 584–598 and II 500–521, holds that this argument is contained in the clause ἐπειδὴ αἱ ποιότητες μεταβάλλονται. If so, the form of statement is extremely infelicitous. But whether it be so or not, the confusion of two arguments, for which I am now contending, becomes equally clear in either case.

Immediately after the above mentioned scholion follow the words: κινοῦνταί τε συνεχῶς αἱ ἄτομοι [φησὶ δ' ἐνδοτέρω καὶ ἰσοταχῶς αὐτὰς κινεῖσθαι τοῦ κενοῦ τὴν εἶξιν ὁμοίαν παρεχομένου καὶ τῇ κουφοτάτῃ καὶ τῇ βαρυτάτῃ] τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ αἱ μὲν εἰς μακρὰν ἀπ' ἀλλήλων διιστάμεναι, αἱ δὲ αὐτὸν τὸν παλμὸν ἴσχουσιν, ὅταν τύχωσι τῇ περιπλοκῇ κεκλιμέναι ἢ στεγαζόμεναι παρὰ τῶν πλεκτικῶν. Usener rightly, as I think, marked the scholion as here indicated by the brackets, whereas Cobet included in it the words τὸν αἰῶνα. On the other hand, Usener is wrong in indicating a lacuna after τὸν αἰῶνα.[1] He believes there should have been made at this point a reference to the downward motion of the atoms due to their weight, and cites Lucretius II. 83 foll. Such difficulties as exist are in great part due, here as frequently in Epicurus, to the intrusion of the scholion. If this is assumed, the required remedy is not far to seek.

Epicurus says that the atoms move continuously forever, and

[1] If there were a lacuna, it must be of considerable length. Epicurus (Diels, Dox. 311ᵃ 10 foll.) said: κινεῖσθαι τὰ ἄτομα τότε μὲν κατὰ στάθμην τότε δὲ κατὰ παρέγκλισιν. This classification of atomic motions is all-embracing. The first sort of motion occurs *before the formation of a* κόσμος, and is thus largely hypothetical, requiring no special mention at this point. The κίνησις κατὰ παρέγκλισιν embraces all motions occurring within a κόσμος. Of these only Epicurus is here speaking. They may be conveniently divided into such as pertain to atoms in a free state and such as belong to them in *concilia*. This classification is here observed by Epicurus, and I see no need of assuming a lacuna. Cp. Brieger, Epikur's Brief an Herodot, p. 4 foll., and Giussani on Lucretius, II. 98.

that some of them rebound afar, while others enter into entangle-
ments. Two changes in the text are clearly required. First, καί
after αἰῶνα is to be omitted. When, by the intrusion of the
scholion, a break was made in the sentence, someone added καί to
supply the needed connective. Next, ἴσχουσιν must be changed
back to ἴσχουσαι, a reading that gave place to the present one
when καί was inserted, evidently in order that the sentence might
have a main verb. Usener's doubts on this score are due to his
assumption of a lacuna. There is, moreover, another phrase that
probably requires emendation, viz. αὐτὸν τὸν παλμὸν ἴσχουσαι. The
use of αὐτόν provokes a question. Cobet rendered 'aliae vero
agitationem *ipsam* continent,' and Munro, on Lucretius II. 98,
says, 'others have *simply* a throbbing or oscillation.' This in-
terpretation assumes that παλμός was a technical term of very
precise meaning, a point not easy to establish.[1] For some such
reason as this, scholars have multiplied conjectures: Schneider
suggested τὸν ἀποπαλμόν, Usener αὖ for αὐτόν, and Brieger, whom
Giussani follows, αὐτοῦ for αὐτόν.

It appears to me that the meaning of ἴσχουσαι affords the clew.
The atoms continue or maintain—what, if not *the self-same oscil-
lation?* The change from αὐτὸν τόν to τὸν αὐτόν[2] is readily made,
and seems to afford the required contrast to the *free* paths of the
atoms that have not entered into *concilia.*

In § 46–48 Epicurus briefly sketches his theory of the εἴδωλα.
At the close of § 48 occur these words: οὐθὲν γὰρ τούτων ἀντιμαρτυρεῖ
ταῖς αἰσθήσεσιν, ἂν βλέπῃ τίς τινα τρόπον τὰς ἐνεργείας, ἵνα καὶ τὰς συμπαθείας
ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξωθεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀνοίσει. For ἀντιμαρτυρεῖ, Weil reads ἀντι-
μαρτυρεῖται. The Tauchnitz stereotype edition prints ἂν βλέπῃ τις,
τίνα τρόπον τὰς ἐνεργείας τὰ εἴδωλα ποιεῖται. To whom the change and
addition are due, I am unable to discover. Gassendi read ἐναργείας
for ἐνεργείας, and Usener, adopting the suggestions of Weil and
Gassendi, follows the MSS with the additional change from ἵνα καί
to τίνα καί. While I incline to think Usener's τίνα καί correct,
I cannot satisfactorily understand his text. If we read τίνα for ἵνα,
then τίνα must, I conceive, stand for τίνα τρόπον. In that case, I
think we should transpose to καὶ τίνα, as καὶ ἵνα would naturally

---

[1] Cp. the synonymous use of πάλσις, in § 50.

[2] For Epicurus' use of ὁ αὐτός in this sense, see two examples in Diog. Laert.
X 114. I suppose nobody would wish to urge the free internal motions of the
flock and the legion (Lucretius II 308–332) against this interpretation. The
parable applies only in its large outlines.

become ἵνα καί when τίνα was mistaken for ἵνα. But if τίνα stands for τίνα τρόπον, then we should doubtless read above ἂν βλέπῃ τις, τίνα τρόπον κτλ. The change from ἀντιμαρτυρεῖ to ἀντιμαρτυρεῖται is not necessary, but is perhaps desirable. I would therefore suggest: οὐθὲν γὰρ τούτων ἀντιμαρτυρεῖται ταῖς αἰσθήσεσιν, ἂν βλέπῃ τις, τίνα τρόπον τὰς ἐναργείας, καὶ τίνα τὰς συμπαθείας [1] ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξωθεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀνοίσει, interpreting the sentence thus: "In all this there is nothing in contradiction with the evidence of the senses (and hence, dealing as we are with an ἄδηλον, we may accept the theory as substantially true, as it has the further advantage of affording a rational explanation of the facts) if one looks to see in what manner one is to trace back to us the sense-impressions and the (other) interactions of things from without."

In § 55 Usener presents this text: καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς παρ' ἡμῖν μετασχηματιζομένοις κατὰ τὴν περιαίρεσιν τὸ σχῆμα ἐνυπάρχον λαμβάνεται, αἱ δὲ ποιότητες οὐκ ἐνυπάρχουσαι ἐν τῷ μεταβάλλοντι, ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνο καταλείπεται, ἀλλ' ἐξ ὅλου τοῦ σώματος ἀπολλύμεναι. A period should be set after λαμβάνεται; but even so the passage is not clear. In the first sentence κατὰ τὴν περιαίρεσιν seems to be incapable of interpretation; probably προαίρεσιν, the reading of G and P[2], followed by Cobet, is to be accepted, since it yields a good sense and the change is palaeographically easy. The second sentence I would write thus: αἱ δὲ ποιότητες, οὐκ ἐνυπάρχουσαι ἐν τῷ μεταβάλλοντι, <οὐχ> ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνο (sc. τὸ μεταβάλλον) καταλείπονται, ἀλλ' ἐξ ὅλου τοῦ σώματος ἀπόλλυνται. "The qualities, however, not inhering in the vehicle of change, do not, like it, remain, but disappear from the entire mass." The negative repeated at the beginning of successive clauses readily accounts for the loss of οὐχ. Cobet's text, reading ἐν τῷ μεταβάλλοντι ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνο, οὐ καταλείπονται would make it necessary to refer ἐκεῖνο to σχῆμα, which is, I think, impossible. The other changes seem to be demanded by the thought.

At the beginning of § 67 occurs an interesting instance of the confusion incident to the intrusion of a scholion into the text. Usener prints ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τόδε γε δεῖ προσκατανοεῖν ὅ τι τὸ ἀσώματον, [Scholion: λέγει γὰρ κατὰ τὴν πλείστην ὁμιλίαν] τοῦ ὀνόματος ἐπὶ τοῦ καθ' ἑαυτὸ νοηθέντος ἄν· καθ' ἑαυτὸ δὲ οὐκ ἔστι νοῆσαι τὸ ἀσώματον πλὴν τοῦ κενοῦ. This text, I dare say, will commend itself to but few. Cobet, failing to detect the scholion, wrote with some freedom ἀλλὰ μὴν

---

[1] Cp. § 50: τὴν φαντασίαν ἀποδιδόντων καὶ τὴν συμπάθειαν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑποκειμένου σῳζόντων.

καὶ τόδε γε δεῖ προσκατανοεῖν, ὅτι τὸ ἀσώματον λέγω κατὰ τὴν πλείστην ὁμιλίαν τοῦ ὀνόματος ἐπὶ τοῦ καθ᾽ ἑαυτὸ νοηθέντος ἄν—in some respects a better text. Lortzing, with the approval of Brieger and Giussani, reads ὅτι τὸ ἀσώματον <οὐ δεῖ κατηγορεῖν τῆς ψυχῆς>, τοῦ ὀνόματος, κτλ. The remedy seems to me extraordinarily simple. The scholion includes the words τοῦ ὀνόματος, and the beginning of the scholion, when it was intruded, crowded out the verb of the ὅτι-clause. The verb was in all probability λέγεται, as this form best accounts for the addition of the marginal note. I would therefore read as follows: ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τόδε γε δεῖ προσκατανοεῖν, ὅτι τὸ ἀσώματον λέγεται [Scholion: λέγει γὰρ κατὰ τὴν πλείστην ὁμιλίαν τοῦ ὀνόματος] ἐπὶ τοῦ καθ᾽ ἑαυτὸ νοηθέντος ἄν. Those who have observed the disjointed character of the letters of Epicurus, resulting from their being composed largely of excerpts taken entire from larger treatises and pieced together, will not require the addition made by Lortzing.

In § 68 Usener has introduced into his text a conjecture paleographically so unlikely that it provokes dissent. He writes: ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τὰ σχήματα καὶ τὰ χρώματα καὶ τὰ μεγέθη καὶ τὰ βάρη καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα κατηγορεῖται σώματος ὡσανεὶ συμβεβηκότα ἢ πᾶσιν ἢ τοῖς ὁρατοῖς καὶ κατὰ τὴν αἴσθησιν σώματος γνωστά, οὔθ᾽ ὡς καθ᾽ ἑαυτάς εἰσι φύσεις δοξαστέον, κτλ. Here everything may go unchallenged except σώματος γνωστά, where the MSS generally have αὐτοῖς γνωστοῖς, except that P² shows αὐτῶν for αὐτοῖς. Usener's γνωστά for γνωστοῖς seems to be demanded by the context; but σώματος is a poor exchange for αὐτοῖς, without which the corruption of γνωστά to γνωστοῖς is not easy to explain. Just what meaning Usener gave to his text, I do not know. Giussani, Lucretius I, p. 28, who adopts Usener's reading, translates it with "e sono riconoscibili mediante il senso del corpo," and that, presumably, was Usener's understanding of it. But κατὰ τὴν αἴσθησιν needs no such addition. I believe that αὐτοῖς is sound, a simple dative of reference, looking to ἢ πᾶσι ἢ τοῖς ὁρατοῖς. Then γνωστά became γνωστοῖς by assimilation to αὐτοῖς.

There are two passages in the second letter of Epicurus, so-called, addressed to Pythocles, of which I will speak briefly. The first occurs in § 96. After saying that solar and lunar eclipses may be accounted for by the quenching of the luminaries or by the interposition of other bodies, the writer is made to say: καὶ ὧδε τοὺς οἰκείους ἀλλήλοις τρόπους συνθεωρητέον, καὶ τὰς ἅμα συγκυρήσεις τινῶν ὅτι οὐκ ἀδύνατον γίνεσθαι. The precise meaning of these words is not clear. It seems probable that they are a misplaced scholion,

having no reference to sun and moon. The occurrence of the word συγκυρήσεις[1] suggests that the passage refers to prognostics or astrology; possibly the 'consenting characters' are those of persons born with the same horoscope. In that case the words should be regarded as a scholion to § 98.

The second passage occurs in § 115. The MSS read: καὶ ἄλλοι δὲ τρόποι εἰς τὸ τοῦτο τελέσαι ἀμύθητοί εἰσιν. Instead of ἀμύθητοί Usener has inserted ἀνύσιμοί, which is undoubtedly a brilliant conjecture. Although the construction gains by the change, I yet have my doubts about it. It is well known how insistent Epicurus was in his endeavor to exclude all reference to religion and astrology from his consideration of meteorological and astronomical phenomena. Particularly in discussing the stars, as in §§ 114, 115, he would naturally repel the idea of having recourse to μῦθος.[2] Hence the emendation of the MSS reading ἀμύθητοί would seem to lead us rather to ἄμυθοι than to ἀνύσιμοί. For this use of ἄμυθος, see Plut., Mor. 16 C. The unusual word would easily be displaced by ἀμύθητος, which was a prime favorite with late writers, as witness Sext. Empiricus.

IOWA COLLEGE, GRINNELL.   W. A. HEIDEL.

---

[1] Cp. §§ 98, 115.

[2] Cp. § 87: δῆλον ὅτι καὶ ἐκ παντὸς ἐκπίπτει φυσιολογήματος, ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν μῖθον καταρρεῖ, and § 104: μόνον ὁ μῖθος ἀπέστω.

V.—SOME DERIVED BASES.

I.

IE. k̂el- AND ITS DERIVATIVES.

The primary meaning of the root k̂el- seems to be 'bend, incline'. From this come ON. *hallr*, OE. *heald*, OHG. *hald* 'bent down, inclined', *halda* 'slope, hill-side', base *k̂ol-to-* 'bending, sloping', OE. *hieldan* 'bend, incline, bend down, bow', *hold* 'gracious, friendly, kind, pleasant; faithful, loyal', Goth. *hulþs* 'hold, gnädig', Lat. *clēmens* 'kind, gentle, gracious' (cf. Kauffmann, PBB, XVIII, 143 f.), with which compare Skt. *çrāma* 'weariness, exertion', base *k̂lo mo-* 'bending, drooping, sinking', *çrāmyati* 'become weary', *çrāmayati* 'overcome, overpower', Dan. *helme* 'nachlassen, aufhören'.

To k̂el- 'bend' we may refer OE. *helor, heolor* 'balance, scales', *heolorian, holrian* 'weigh'. Compare Gk. κλίνω τάλαντα 'turn the scales'.

The meaning 'bend, turn' is prominent in Lith. *szalìs* 'side, region', *szalìnis* 'lateral', *szalinéju* 'wander about', *szalè* 'by the side of'. With these have been compared ON. *halfa* 'side, region, province', OE. *healf* 'side, half, part, party', Goth. *halba* 'side, half', *halbs*, etc., base *k̂ol-bho-*. (So among others Grienberger, Got. Wortkunde 107 f.) Here also, from a base *k̂lengo-*, may belong OE. *hlinc* 'slope, hill', *hlence*, ON. *hlekkr* 'link', OHG. *hlanca* 'loin, hip, flank', MHG. *link* 'left', *lenken* 'bend, turn', *gelenke*, etc. OE. *hlanc* 'lean, lank', with which compare Goth. *halks* 'gering, arm, dürftig'. Compare OE. *lūtan* 'bend, turn': *lȳtel* 'little, small', OHG. *luzzil, luzīg* 'klein, elend, erbärmlich' (cf. Schade, Wb.).

From k̂el- comes the base k̂le-i̯o-, k̂lī-: Skt. *çráyati* 'incline, lean on, lay upon', Lith. *szlëjù* 'lean against', Gk. κλίνω 'bend, incline', OHG. *hlinēn*, OE. *hlinian* 'lean', Goth. *hlains* 'hill', *hleiduma* 'left', Gk. κλίμα 'slope; region; weather'; κλίσις 'a bending, turning aside, wheeling right or left (of soldiers); region', κλίτος 'slope, clime', κλῖτος, κλιτύς 'slope, declivity', OE. *hliþ* neut. 'slope', *hleda* 'seat', ON. *hlīð* fem. 'slope, mountain-side', *hlið*

fem. 'side', *hliđa, hliđra* 'turn aside', Dan. *led* 'side, region', *lid*, *lide* 'region, side, declivity, slope', OHG. *lita* 'abhang, leite', Lat. *in-clīnō, clīvus*, etc. (cf. Schade, Wb.; Fick, Wb. I', 44).

From 'bend, incline' comes 'lay over, fold; overlay, cover'. So in the following: OE. *hlīdan* 'cover,' *hlid* 'cover, lid, door', ON. *hliđ* 'door', OHG. *lit* 'lid', Goth. *hleiþra, hlija* 'hut, tent', Gk. κλισία, 'hut', ἐκέκλιτο 'lay hid', Iliad V 356, Skt. *vi-çrấyati* 'unfold, open'.

Of course the roots *k̑el-* and *k̑lī-* are often used figuratively. E. g. Skt. *pra-çrita* 'humble, modest', Lat. *inclīnātus* 'sunken, fallen, deteriorated', OIr. *cloin* 'crooked, unjust, wrong', etc. So also OE *hieldan* 'bend, incline, bend down,' ON. *halla* 'bend': 'blame, censure'; Skt. *çrāpayati* 'cause to lean, bend': Lat. *culpa* 'failure, defect, fault', *culpō* 'blame, censure'; Goth. *halbs* 'half', *halba* 'side, half', ON. *halfa* 'side, region, land, province': Lith. *szalbérius* 'deceiver, cheat', *szalberiůju* 'practice cheating', from a base *k̑ol-bho-* 'sloping, slanting, crooked'.

A base *k̑le-u̯o-, *k̑lo-u̯o-* 'bending, curved' is presupposed by OE. *hlēor*, OS. *hlior*, ON. *hlȳr* 'cheek,' pre-Germ. *k̑leu-só*, and Skt. *çroṇi-ş* 'buttocks, hip', Av. *sraoni-* 'hip', Lith. *szlaunis*, OPruss. *slaunis* 'thigh', Lat. *clūnis*, Welsh *clūn*, ON. *hlaun* 'buttocks', base *k̑lou-ni-*. Compare Skt. *váñcati* 'geht schief, geht krumm, wankt': OHG. *wanga* 'wange'; MHG. *lenken* 'biegen, wenden': OHG. *hlanca* 'hüfte, lende'.

The same *k̑lū-* 'bend, incline' occurs in the sense 'fall, stumble, limp'. Compare Skt. *çrávaṇa, çrōṇấ* 'lame'; Lith. *szlauźu* 'sneak, crawl', *szliůziu* 'trail, drag', *szliůżės* 'sledge, skate'; *szlůbas* 'limping, lame', *szlubůju* 'limp' (to which Goth. *-hlaupan* 'spring, run', OE. *hlēapan* 'leap, dance', etc. may belong rather than to Lith. *klůpti* 'kneel, stumble', etc.); Lat. *claudus* 'limping, lame', *claudeō* 'limp, halt, falter'.

Similarly *k̑el-* and *k̑lī*. Compare Lith. *pa-szlůnůs* 'sloping, precipitous', base *k̑lō-nu-* (with which perhaps is connected Skt. *vi-çrāṇayati* 'give away', primarily 'turn away from oneself'); ON. *hallr* 'slanting, sloping, crooked', pre-Germ. *k̑ól-to-*; Goth. *halts*, OE. *healt*, OHG. *halz*, ON. *haltr* 'halt, lame', *haltra* 'halt, limp', OE. *healtian* 'limp', pre-Germ. base *k̑ol-do-*; Lith. *szlėjů* 'lean against', *szlajůs* 'slanting, crooked', *szleivas* 'bow-legged', *szlivůju* 'walk bow-legged, limp'.

It is safe therefore to identify *k̑el-* 'incline' with *k̑el-* 'cover, protect, conceal, hide'. Here belong among others Skt. *çaraṇd*

'protecting', as neut. noun, 'protection, shelter, refuge', *ǵárman* 'protection, shelter, cover', Goth. *hilms*, OE., OHG. *helm* 'helmet', OE., OS., OHG. *helan* 'hide, conceal', Lat. *cĕlō*, etc. (cf. Fick, Wb. I⁴, 44).

These naturally produce many derived meanings. 'Protector' is probably the basal idea in ON. *halr* 'man, master, husband', *holđr* 'hero, man, freeholder', OE *hœleþ* 'man, hero', OHG. *helid* 'held'. Compare OE. *helm* 'helmet, covering: protector, lord'. Similarly I should connect OE. *hlāf-* in *hlāford-* 'lord', *hlǣfdige* 'lady' with ON. *hlífa*, OHG. *līban* 'protect, spare', Goth. *hleibjan* 'spare, assist', Lat. *clipeus* 'shield', and refer all to the root *k̂lī-* 'lean, cover, protect', which is evident from ON. *hlíf* 'shield, protection, defense' (cf. author, Mod. Lang. Notes, XV, 328).

From the primary meaning 'covered' come the following color-words: Lat. *colos*, *color* 'outward appearance, hue, complexion, color, brilliancy', *colōreus* 'colored, variegated', *colōrō* 'color, tinge, color reddish or brownish' (Fick, Wb. I⁴, 386). The same base *k̂olos-*, *k̂oles-* occurs in Goth. *hulistr* 'covering, veil', pre-Germ. *k̂ɔles-tro-*, OE. *helustr*, *heolstor* 'hiding-place, concealment, darkness', as adj. 'dark', *heolstrig* 'dark', pre-Germ. *k̂elos-tro-*. The same development of meaning is perhaps also in Gk. κελαινός 'dark, black', κελαινεφής 'black with clouds, dark, dark-colored', κελαινο-φαής 'dark-gleaming, murky', etc. (cf. Fick as above). Compare also Lith. *szeszélis* 'shadow'.

From 'covered, sheltered' comes 'warm'. This change of meaning is seen in the following: OE. *hlēo(w)* (from *hlĕwa-*) 'covering, shelter, refuge, protection, protector', *ge-hlēow* 'sheltered, warm (place)', *hlēowe* 'warm', *hlīewþ* 'covering, shelter, warmth', *hlīewan* 'cover, shelter, cherish, warm', *hlēowan* 'become warm', *hlēonaþ* 'shelter', ON. *hlē* (from *hlewa-*) 'shelter, protection', *hlý* (from *hliu(i)* not *hlīµa*) 'shelter, protection', OSw. *lið*, ON. *hlýr* 'mild, warm', *hlýja* 'warm', *hlōa* 'be warm', *hlýna* 'become warm', *hlynna* 'protect, aid', Dan. *lun* 'covered, sheltered, warm', *lune* 'cover, protect, shelter, warm', OHG. *lāo*, MHG. *lā* (stem *hlēwa-*) 'lau'.

The Germ. base *hlĕwa-* (from which *hlŭ-na-*), pre-Germ. *k̂lĕ-µo-*, is related to the base *k̂ɔl-*, *k̂ɔlĕ-* in Lith. *szìlti* 'become warm', *szìldau* 'warm, heat', *szìltas* 'warm', *szilumà* 'warmth, warm place', Lat. *caleō*, *calescō*, *calor*, *calidus* (cf. J. Schmidt, Vok. II, 454). To these belong Lith. *szilus* 'August', Skt. *ǵarád* 'autumn', Av. *saređa-*, NPers. *sāl* 'year', Osset. *särdä*, *särd* 'summer' (cf. author, AJP. XXI, 182).

In ON. *hlynna* 'protect, aid' occurs a development of meaning that is also in *k̂el-* and *k̂lī-*. Thus we may explain Lith. *szelpiù* 'aid, assist, promote', *szelbiùs* 'try to help oneself', Goth. *hilpan*, OE. *helpan* 'help', etc. So also ON. *hlīf* 'shield, protection', *hlīfa* 'protect, spare', Goth. *hleibjan* ' ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι, aid, assist'.

From 'protection' come also the ideas 'safety, joy, happiness', etc. So in Skt. *çarman* 'schirm, schutz, hut, heil, rettung, freude, glück', *çarmin* 'glückselig'. This furnishes us with the explanation of the base *k̂lī-* in the following: Skt. *çriyā* 'welfare, happiness', *çrī* 'happiness, wealth, majesty, beauty, splendor'; *çrīka* 'splendor, eminence', OE. *hlīgan* 'give a reputation for (wisdom), attribute to', *hlīgsa*, *hlīsa* 'report, rumor, reputation, fame', OFries. *hlīgene*, *hlinga* 'expression, acknowledgment', *hlia* 'report, declare, acknowledge'; Skt. *çrīda* 'giving happiness', ON. *hlīt* 'satisfaction, sufficiency', pre-Germ. **k̂lī-dā-* 'giving protection, joy, befriedigend', ON. *hlīta* 'be satisfied with; make use of, use', primarily, in this last sense, 'enjoy', as in Lat. *fruor*; Skt. *çrīla* 'beautiful, renowned'; *çrīmant* 'beautiful, magnificent, excellent', *çrēmán* 'preeminence, magnificence'; *çrēyāns* 'fairer, more excellent, better', etc. The development here is 'protect, guard, give heed to, cherish, prize, value, treasure', etc.

Of similar development is the root *k̂l̥-nu-*, *k̂le-ụo-*, *k̂lŭ-* 'perceive, hear', primarily, 'turn to, give attention to, give heed to', as is evident from the following: Skt. *çr̥ṇôti* 'give heed to, study, learn, perceive, hear', *çrutá* 'perceived, heard, mentioned, made known, renowned', *çrōṣati* 'hear', *çúçrūṣatē* 'wait upon, serve, obey' (with which compare Lith. *szlusznùs* 'dienstfertig', *szlùżbà*, Pol. *służba* 'service', Lith. *szlùżyju* 'serve', Pol. *słuchać* 'hear, obey', *służuć* 'serve', OChSl. *slūga* 'servant', *slūžiti* 'serve'), Skt. *çravd* 'hearing, ear; sounding', *çrávaṇa* 'hearing, learning, reputation, ear', *çrávas* 'call, sound, praise, renown; eagerness, desire', *çravasyáti* 'be quick, eager', *çravasyú* 'quick, nimble, eager, desirous of praise'; ON. *hliōd* 'attention, silence; sound, tone, voice, song, poem', *hliōd-ligr* 'quietly, still', *hliōd-leiki* 'silence', *hliōdna* 'become silent', *hliōdr* 'quiet, still, pensive', *hlȳda* 'listen to, obey, attend to, wait upon, help', Goth. *hliuþ* 'attention, silence', OE. *hlēopor* 'hearing, sound, melody, song, voice, speaking', *hlūd* 'loud'; OHG. *hlosēn* 'listen to, harken', OS. *hlust* 'attentive listening', OE. *hlystan*, *hlysnan* 'listen', *hlosnian* 'listen for, listen in suspense, be astonished'; ON. *hliōmr* 'sound, noise',

hliōma 'resound', Goth. *hliuma* 'hearing', OHG. *hliumunt* 'report, renown', Skt. *çrŏmata* 'reputation, renown'; *çrávas* 'sound, praise', etc., Av. *sravah-* 'word', Gk. κλέος 'renown', OChS. *slovo* 'word', *slava* 'renown', Pol. *sława* 'honor, renown', Lith. *szlovè* 'splendor, magnificence', *szlovyju, szlóvinu* 'praise, laud, glorify', *szlŏvnas* 'renowned, magnificent', *szlovus* 'honored', etc.

II.

IE. *eleṷo-, lĕṷo-* AND ITS DERIVATIVES.

This root denoted primarily a sudden or rapid separation. Used intransitively this would give 'spring forth, fall off, fall away, leave, abandon'; transitively, 'pull, cut, break, beat, excite'. From this primary meaning come the following: Gk. ἔλυται· ἔρχεται (Hesych.), ἀλεύω 'remove, keep far from', ἀλέομαι 'avoid, shun, flee, escape, neglect, ἀλύω 'wander, be excited,—distracted, —frantic', ἀλωή 'threshing-floor, garden, orchard' from *ǝlŏṷā- 'free, open space', Goth. *lēw* 'opportunity, occasion', pre-Germ. *lēṷo-m* 'freeness, freedom, license', Goth. *lēwjan* 'betray', *ga-lēwjan* 'give up, betray; present, offer', Czech. *leviti* 'yield', Lett. *ljaut* 'admit, permit', Lith. *liáutis* 'cease', OPruss. *au-lāut* 'die'; ON. *lȳja* 'beat, strike, weaken', Skt. *láva* 'cut, section, piece, drop, particle, anything cut off, hair, wool', *lunáti, lunŏti* 'cut, mow, cut off, pluck, tear', *lūni* 'a cutting off', Goth. *lun* 'ransom', Gk. λύω 'loose, loosen, set free', Lat. *luŏ* 'release, atone for, pay'; OE. *lēas* 'devoid of, false, vain', Goth. *laus* 'empty, vain', ON. *lauss* 'free, loose, invalid, weak', OHG. *lōs* 'free, deprived of, loose, sportive, wanton', Goth. *lausjan* 'loose, deliver', *fra-liusan* 'loose', *fra-lusnan* 'be lost, perish', OE. *losian* 'be lost, escape, perish', *los, lor* 'loss, perishing', *lēoran* 'depart, pass away, die', etc. (cf. Schade, Wb.; Kluge, Et. Wb.; Uhlenbeck, Et. Wb., Ai. Wb.; Persson, Wz. 83, 129).

Here probably belong also Germ. *lus-tu-* 'looseness, sportiveness, wantonness, joy, pleasure, lust', Goth. *lustus*, etc. (cf. Schade, Wb. s. v.), and ON. *ljŏsta* 'strike'. Compare ON. *lȳja* 'beat, strike'.

Starting from a common centre the great variety of meanings is easily explained. And the words added below are semasiologically not more remote from this centre than are the words usually referred to the root *leu-*. Such significations as 'beat' in ON. *lȳja*, 'pluck' in Skt. *lunáti*, 'ransom' in Goth. *lun*, 'false'

in OE. *lēas*, 'die' in OPruss. *au-lāut*, OE. *lēoran* could not be explained from each other, but become clear when derived from a common centre. Such is the only scientific method of explanation. Let us examine thus the roots *leu-t-*, *leu-d-*, *leu-dh-*, *leu-l-*, *leu-r-*, *leu-p-*, etc. That these need not be separated, as far as the meaning is concerned, from the simple root *leu-* must be evident to all.

Root *leu-t-*: Gk. λύσσα <*λυτ_ια 'rage', Arc. λευτός 'wild', OChSl. *ljutŭ* 'violent', *ljutì* 'labor', Lith. *lutis* 'storm' (Prellwitz, Et. Wb.). These contain the idea of quick or violent motion implied in Skt. *lunāti* 'tear', ON. *lȳja* 'beat', Gk. ἀλύω 'wander, be excited, rave', ἄλυσις 'distress, anguish'. To the same base belong OHG. *lotar* 'loose, wanton, tricky', MHG. *loter*, *lotter* 'wanton fellow, trickster, juggler', OE. *loddere* 'beggar, pauper', *lodrung* 'triviality', *lȳpre* 'base, bad', MHG. *liederlich* 'frivolous, light, dainty'. Here we have 'free, loose, wanton' (cf. Schade, Wb.; Kluge, Et. Wb.). Here also may belong Goth. *liupōn* 'sing', primarily 'be wanton, exult'.

Root *leu-d-*: OE. *lūtan* 'turn, bend, bow, fall', ON. *lūta* 'bend, incline', OE. *lūtian*, OHG. *lūzēn* 'lie hid, lurk' Goth. *lutōn* 'deceive', *liuts* 'deceitful, hypocrite', OE. *lot* 'deceit', Lith. *liūdnas* 'sad, downcast', OChSl. *ludŭ* 'foolish', Welsh *lludded* 'weariness', OHG. *luzīg*, OS. *luttic* 'small', *luttil*, OHG. *luzzil* 'small, little, wretched', OE. *lȳtel* 'little, small', *lȳt* 'to a slight degree, little' (cf. Schade, Wb. s. v. *lūta*; Uhlenbeck, Et. Wb. s. v. *liuts*; Persson, Wz. 25). The development here is: 'fall, sink; cause to fall, bend, bow'. From this readily come 'stoop, crouch, lie hid, conceal, deceive'; 'downcast, drooping; weary; sad; little'. Compare also OHG. *loscēn* 'lurk, lie hid', Dan. *luske* 'slink, crawl', which may be from a base *lud-sqē-*. Or they may equally well be referred to a base *lus-qē-* (-*qo-*) from a root *leu-s-* 'lurk, crawl', which may be assumed from OHG., ON., OE. *lūs* 'louse' primarily 'crawler', ON. *lȳski* 'vermin', Dan. *lyske* 'catch lice'.

Root *leu-dh-*: Gk. ἐλεύσομαι 'shall go,—come', ἤλυθον 'went, came', ἐλεύθερος 'free', Osc. *lúvfreis* 'liberi', Goth. *liudan* 'grow', OE. *lēodan* 'sprout, grow', ON. *lodenn* 'rough, hairy, overgrown', Skt. *ródhati* 'grow, mount' (cf. Uhlenbeck, Ai. Wb. s. v.), NHG. (dial.) *lodern* 'grow luxuriantly', *lodern* 'blaze up' (cf. Kluge, Et. Wb. s. v.). Compare Gk. ἔλυται 'goes' (Hesych.) ἀλεύω 'remove', etc.

Root *leu-l-* : Skt. *lŏlati* 'move to and fro', *lulita* 'moving, fluttering, waving', *lōla* 'swaying, unsteady, eager, desirous', Czech. *lulati*, Serv. *ljuljati* 'swing, rock, lull' (Uhlenbeck, Ai. Wb.), Lith. *liulēti* 'sich geleeartig bewegen', *liulys* 'lubber', *liulýnas* 'bog, quagmire'.

Root *leu-r-* : Gk. λευρός 'open, smooth, level, polished', λαύρα 'narrow passage', Lat. *lūra* 'mouth of a leathern bag' (Prellwitz, Et. Wb.), Gk. λύρα 'lyre', primarily 'hollow' or 'hollow-shell', MHG. *lūren* 'lauern', *lūr(e)* 'lauer, hinterhalt' *lūre* 'schlauer, hinterlistiger Mensch', ME. *loure* 'lower', *lurke* 'lurk', ON. *lūra* 'slumber', Lith. *liūrūju* 'lurk' (loan-word?). The primary meaning is: 'fall away, sink, bend, crouch, lurk' as in the root *leud-* above.

Root *leu-p-* : Skt. *lup* 'falling off, disappearance', *lumpáti* 'break, injure, rob', OChSl. *lupiti* 'pull off, peel', Lith. *lùpti* 'peel', Goth. *laufs* 'leaf', Gk. λύπη 'pain, grief', λυπέω 'distress, annoy', etc., plainly from *lŭ* in Skt. *lunáti* 'cut, pluck, tear', etc. (Prellwitz, Et. Wb.). Compare with these the root *leu-b-* in Ir. *luib* 'plant' Russ. *lubŭ*, Lat. *liber* 'bark', *delubrum* 'fustis delibratus', OPruss. *lubbo*, Lith. *lubà* 'board', *lùbos* 'board ceiling', Lett. *luba* 'ein Vorbau', Lith. *liaubė* 'enclosure for geese', ON. *laupr* 'vergittertes Traggestell, Korb', OE. *lēap* 'basket, weel (for catching fish), trunk' (of body), ON. *lopt* 'loft,' Germ. *lubja-* 'a drawing plant, epispastic': Goth. *lubja-leis*, OHG. *luppi*, etc.

In the roots *leu-p-*, *leu-b-* we find the following development: 'remove, pull off, tear off', etc.; 'anything pulled off, leaf, bark', etc.; 'anything made of what is pulled off or peeled, basket, latticework, stick, board', etc.; 'pull up, raise, lift', etc. Compare also Skt. *rōpáyati* 'lift, raise, cultivate', MHG. *lupfen, lüpfen* 'lift, rise, move hastily', ON. *lypta* 'lift', *lopt*, Goth. *luftus*, OHG. *luft*, OE. *lyft* 'luft' (cf. author, JGPh. II, 221; Uhlenbeck, Ai. Wb. s. v. *rōpáyati*). Here belong E. *lop* 'cut off, as the top or extreme part of anything, shorten, cut off, or remove, as superfluous parts; cut partly off and bend down; hang down, be pendent, lean to one side; let hang down', *lop* 'hanging down, pendent', *lop* 'that which is lopped from anything, as branches from a tree'.

Root *leu-bh-* : Skt. *lúbhyati* 'wander, be excited, be eager, desire', *lōbhayati* 'confuse, excite, arouse', Lat. *lubido* 'desire, lust', Goth. *liufs* 'dear, beloved', *ga-laufs* 'valued' *us-laubjan* 'allow', *ga-laubjan* 'believe', etc. We have here 'depart from, be excited, be eager', etc., and 'yield to, permit, admit, believe'.

14

Compare Gk. ἀλύω 'wander, be excited', Czech. *leviti* 'yield', Lett. *ljaut* 'admit, permit, allow', Goth. *lēw* 'opportunity', Lith. *liáutis* 'cease', *liauba* 'cessation'. For meaning compare Lat. *cēdō* 'go, go away; yield to, grant, permit, allow'.

The idea of 'desire' developed from that of 'quick, excited motion, eagerness'. So OHG. *lōs* 'frei; fröhlich, mutwillig; leichtfertig', MHG. *lōse* 'leichtfertig; lieblich', *lōsen* 'los sein, fröhlich, freundlich sein', Goth. *lustus*, etc.; Skt. *lōlati* 'move to and fro', *lōla* 'swaying, unsteady, eager, desirous'. Compare Gk. σπέρχω 'drive, hasten', Skt. *spṛhayati* 'strive for, desire eagerly'; Skt. *cōpati* 'move, stir', *kupyati* 'be excited, boil', Lat. *cupiō*; and many others.

Root *leu-ĝ-* 'pull off, break, tear; pull, bend, twist, writhe, suffer; twist, twine, tie, bind, enclose': Lith. *láužiu* 'break', Russ. *luznutĭ* 'strike, thrust', Gk. λυγίζω 'bend, twist, writhe, struggle, suffer', λύγος 'pliant twig', λυγόω 'overcome', λυγρός, λευγαλέος 'sad, wretched', Lat. *luctor* 'struggle, wrestle', *lūgeō* 'mourn', *luctus* 'sorrow, lamentation', ON. *lykna* 'bend the knees', OHG. *liohhan* 'pull, scuffle', Goth. *us-lūkan* 'draw out, open', *ga-lūkan* ('draw together'), 'enclose, shut in', OE. *lūcan* 'pull up; intertwine, confine, close', etc. Compare OE. *wrīþan* 'twist: bind', *wrāþ* 'angry, harsh, grievous'; *tēon* 'draw, pull': *tīegan* 'connect, tie'. (Cf. on this group Prellwitz, Et. Wb. s. v. λυγίζω, λευγαλέος; Schade, Wb. s. v. *lūhhan*; Kluge, Et. Wb. s. v. *Loch, Locke*; Uhlenbeck, Et. Wb. s. v. *galūkan*; Ai. Wb. s. v. *rujáti*; author, JGPh. II, 224 f.) These words certainly need not be separated, on account of their meaning, from Skt. *lunáti* 'cut off, pluck, tear', ON. *lȳja* 'beat, strike'.

Root *leu-gh-*: OIr. *logaissi* 'mendacii', *follugaim* 'conceal' (from **vo-lugō*), OChSl. *lŭgati* 'lie', Goth. *liugan* 'lügen', etc. (Uhlenbeck, Et. Wb.). We may assume here the same development in meaning as in the root *leud-* above. Compare OE. *logþor* 'wily, clever', Lith. *lugnas* 'pliant, yielding', *liŭgas* 'marsh', i. e., 'bending, yielding ground' (compare *liulýnas* 'bog', *liunas* 'marsh'), *liunginu* 'wag the tail, caress', *luñguriu* 'wag the tail, fawn upon', Dan. *logre* 'wedeln, schwänzeln, (vor einem) kriechen', OHG. *lucchen, lockōn*, ON. *lokka*, Dan. *lokke* '*locken*', OE. *loccian* 'entice, soothe', MHG. *loger, locker, lücke* 'locker'. (Cf. Persson, Wz. 25, where the roots *leu-gh-, leu-d-, leu-s-* are compared; and Noreen, Urgerm-Lautl. 156, where *lügen* and *locken* are combined.)

On this connection compare Skt. *lūna* 'tail': Lith. *liunas* 'marsh': ON. *laun* 'secrecy, secret', Dan. *løn-* 'secret', *i-løn* 'secretly, stealthily'. The common meaning here is 'bend', 'sway'—a meaning which appears in many of the secondary roots derived from *leu-*. It is therefore not necessary to refer ON. *laun* 'secrecy', *leyna* 'conceal' to the root *leu-gh-*.

The root *leu-gh-* or *leu-ĝh-* occurs in Goth. *liugan* 'marry', *liuga* 'marriage', Ir. *luige* 'oath', OHG. *ur-liugi* 'war' (cf. Uhlenbeck, Et. Wb. s. v. *liugan* 'heiraten'). The underlying meaning here is 'bind', which developed as in the root *leu-ĝ-* (cf. author, JGPh. II, 224). Or else the development is 'yield to, agree to, promise' as in the root *leu-bh-*: OHG. *lobōn, lobēn* 'approve, praise, promise', *gi-lobōn* 'geloben', *gilubida* 'Gelübde', MHG. *verloben* 'geloben, verloben, vermählen'.

Root *leu-q-* : Skt. *luñcati* 'pull, pluck, tear off, hull, shell', OPrus. *lunkan*, Lith. *lùnkas*, Let. *lūks*, OChSl. *lyko* 'inner bark, bast', OPrus. *luckis*, NSlov. *luč* 'piece of wood', Serv. *luč*, Russ. *luča* 'rosin' (cf. Berneker, Preus. Spr. 305), Lith. *lùksztinu* 'shell, hull, husk', Skt. *luk* 'falling off, disappearance', *lōkā* 'open place, space, world', Lith. *laûkas* 'field', Lat. *lūcus* 'grove', OHG. *lōh* 'overgrown clearing', OE. *lēah* 'meadow, field', E. *lea* (cf. Schade, Wb. s. v. *lōh*). This entire group is from the base *leu-qo-, lu-qo-* 'pulling, plucking, clearing; pulled, plucked, cleared'. It is from this passive use that the wide-spread IE. root *leuq-* 'be clear, bright, shine' developed: Lith. *laûkas* 'bald-faced' (of cattle), Gk. λευκός 'bright, clear, light' Skt. *rōkā* 'brightness, light', Lat. *lūx*, Goth. *liuhaþ*, OHG. *lioht* 'light', *loug*, MHG. *louc, lohe* 'flame, blaze', etc. (cf. Prellwitz, Et. Wb. s. v. λευκός; Kluge, Et. Wb. s. v. *Licht, Lohe*; Uhlenbeck, Ai. Wb. s. v. *lokás, rokás*, etc.)

The development 'pull, pluck, clear; fall away, become clear' occurs in other derivatives of the root, *leu-*. Compare Skt. *lāva* 'cut, section, anything cut off', *lāva* 'cutting, plucking': Gk. ἀλωή 'clear open space, garden, field' (cf. Prellwitz, Et. Wb. s. v.), Goth. *lēw* 'opportunity' (v. supra), Lat. *lēvis* 'smooth, beardless, rubbed smooth', Gk. λεῖος < *lēu-io-s* 'smooth, level, even, polished', λευ-ρό-ς 'smooth, level, even, polished'.

Closely connected with 'clear, smooth' is the development 'clear, free' as in Gk. λύω 'loose, free', Goth. *lūn* 'ransom', OHG. *lōs* 'loose, free', Gk. ἐλεύθερος 'free'.

<div align="right">Francis A. Wood.</div>

NOTE.

The new edition of Parthenius' περὶ ἐρωτικῶν παθημάτων, by Edgar
Martini (Teubner, 1902) which brings the little series of love-tales
up to date by collecting most of the more recent emendations,
including those contributed to A. J. P. VII (1886) by the present
writer, and which contains besides all the extant fragments of
Parthenius' other works, has suggested to me in a re-perusal the
following new conjectures :

'Ερ. παθ. 21 fin. αἰσθόμενος δ' ὁ Σίθων τόν τε ἔρωτα καὶ τὴν ἐπιβουλὴν τῆς
θυγατρός, μάλα μεγάλην πυρὰν νήσας καὶ ἐπιθεὶς τὸν Δρύαντα †οιστεοσιν
ἐπισφάξειν καὶ τὴν Παλλήνην.

This may be a corruption of τοῖος ἦν (τεοσιν) οἷος 'was in a mood
to think of killing besides': οἷος had been omitted in its place and
afterwards taken in before τοῖος ἦν. This, besides being a not
unfrequent fact of palaeography, would easily happen here,
because οἷος ἦν was a more common usage than τοῖος ἦν οἷος.

XXVII, 2 ὅθεν εἰς τοσοῦτον †τε ἐλθεῖν ὥστε ἀπολιπεῖν οἶκόν τε καὶ
παῖδας ἤδη γεγονότας.

Possibly τοσοῦτόν τι.

XXIX, 1 'Εν Σικελίᾳ δὲ Δάφνις 'Ερμοῦ παῖς ἐγένετο σύριγγι †δή τε δεξιῶς
χρήσασθαι καὶ τὴν ἰδέαν ἐκπρεπής.

Perhaps σύριγγι εἰ δή τις δεξιός χρήσασθαι.

In the following passages I venture to dissent from Martini.

XV, 1 παρασκευασαμένη δὲ πυκνὰς ἐθήρευεν ἔστιν ὅτε καὶ ἐν τῇ Λακωνικῇ
καὶ ἐπιφοιτῶσα εἰς τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς Πελοποννήσου ὄρη.

πυκνάς, I think, may be 'close meshed' nets, sc. ἄρκυας; at any
rate Zangemeister's view that υκνάς conceals an original κύνας
must be considered very doubtful. And I see that Drexler holds
a very similar opinion to mine, except that he would add ἄρκυς
instead of mentally supplying it.

XVIII, 1 νύκτωρ αὐτοῦ κοιμωμένου ἐπεισέρχεται ἡ Νέαιρα καὶ πρῶτον μὲν
οἷα τε ἦν πείθειν αὐτόν, ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐκεῖνος οὐκ †ἐδίδου Δία τε ἑταιρήιον καὶ ξένιον
αἰδούμενος, προσέταξεν ἡ Νέαιρα ταῖς θεραπαίναις ἀποκλεῖσαι τὸν θάλαμον.

Heyne conj. ἐνεδίδου: but ἐδίδου seems here to be used *amatorie*,
declined to grant his favours, i. e. withheld them.

In reading these stories, the Ovidian *Ibis* inevitably recurs to
the memory. I am not sure, indeed, that XXXV περὶ Εὐλιμένης is

not the explanation of one of the most disputed Ibis-distichs, 607, 8.

> Qua sua Penteliden proles est ulta Lycurgum,
> Haec maneat teli te quoque plaga novi.

Parthenius' story is as follows: Cydon, a dynast in Crete, had betrothed his daughter Eulimene to a leading Cretan named Apterus (King Apteras, as he is called by Eusebius, Chron. II 30). Eulimene, however, was beloved by another Cretan named *Lycastus.* Some of the Cretan towns having revolted from Cydon and conquered him, he sent to Delphi to inquire by what means he was to be successful against them. The oracle commanded him to sacrifice a virgin: lots were cast, and Eulimene was selected. Lycastus in alarm confessed that he had long loved and consorted with Eulimene. The people assembled, we may suppose, to judge the case, were more than ever determined that she should die. After the execution, Cydon ordered the priest to cut open the womb, upon which she was found pregnant. Then Apterus, incensed at the indignity put upon him by Lycastus, laid an ambuscade and killed him.

Reading *Lycastum* for *Lycurgum,* I would then translate the distich thus: 'May the stroke that is in store for you be dealt by the same unlooked for weapon by means of which Lycastus' unborn child punished its father'. The barbarous outrage (on Eulimene's body,) of which Lycastus was the ultimate cause, brought him in his turn the surprise of an equally unlooked for death; in this way the unborn child *punished its father.*

If *Lycastum* in the Ibis-distich was corrupted to *Lycurgum,* it is nothing strange to find *Prataliden* has become *Penteliden,* or *Pentiladen* (so the excellent Gale MS), or *Pentheliden* or *Penthidem.* Such transformations of proper names are common generally; very common in Ovid's *Metamorphoses,* and in the *Ibis.* What is more to the purpose, we have a corruption of an almost identical kind in v. 447 of this very poem; for *Panthoides* has there become *Penthides, Pentelides, Pithoides* in different MSS. That *Lycastus* is called *Pratalides* I infer from Anth. P. VII, 449, 450, two epigrams which have become amalgamated, but which are certainly distinct (Stadtmüller). In both, the man on whose tomb the epigrams are supposed to be written is called Πραταλίδας Λυκάστιος which might be either Lycastius, son of Pratalus, or Pratalidas of the town Lycastus. The lemmata in P (the Palatine codex) point to an early doubt on this point: the original lemma εἰς Λύκαστον υἱὸν Πρατάλου τὸν Κρῆτα has been erased and εἰς Πρα-

ταλίδαν Κρῆτα τὸν Λυκάστιον substituted. Moreover in v. 1 P gives not Λυκαστίω (Ionic genitive) but Λυκάστου corrected to Λυκάστωι|Λυκαστίω (Saumaise) must be right, as in v. 7 ὁ Λυκάστιος is indubitable in P, and in both vv. this word occupies the same place, preceding the 5th foot. This doubt probably rose from the fact that Lycastus is alternately the name of a town (Il. II. 647) in Crete, and of a Cretan hero. Eustathius on Il. II. 647 Λύκαστος δὲ ἀπὸ Λυκάστου φασὶν αὐτόχθονος ἢ παιδὸς Μίνωος, words which recur in the geographical lexicon of Steph. Byz. This being so, it seems likely that the writer of the original lemma in P believed Lycastus and Lycastius to be both alike names of a *person:* and that the author of the *Ibis,* following the same tradition used Lycastus as the name of a Cretan hero.

The legend being Cretan, I should suppose that the Pratalidas Lycastius of the Greek epigrams was, not, as might be thought from the description of him as successful in love, hunting, dancing and war, an actual contemporary of the poet (Leonidas of Tarentum), but an epichorian hero, for whom he was asked to write an inscription. It is obvious that Parthenius' Lycastus was also such an epichorian hero; but whether the same as the Lycastus of the epigram, whether identical with Lycastus (or Lycastius) son of Pratalus, it is hard to pronounce. Nor can we say with any confidence that the writer of the *Ibis* drew his *Prataliden* from Leonidas; all we can see is that supposing I am right in my conjecture *Lycastum* for *Lycurgum,* he must have been following a *Cretan* legend; such a Cretan Lycastus is found both in Parthenius' tale and Leonidas' epigrams; in the latter with the addition of Pratalidas: it is no remote inference that Pratalidas had become associated with the other name Lycastus, and that in the Ibis-distich we have a survival of this association.

That my interpretation of *noui* is doubtful, I am ready to concede. It is of course, possible that some *new kind of weapon,* was employed to snare Lycastus, or that something not usually employed for purposes of death, was turned to that purpose on this occasion. We must be content to remain in doubt until some further account of the incident is discovered. Meanwhile the combination of the double name in the Greek Anthology and its closeness to the *Pentiladen Lycurgum* of the *Ibis* cannot fail to strike any one in the least degree familiar either with the corruptions of the *Ibis* in particular, or the variations of mythological and epichorian legend, so familiar to us in the literature of Greece.   ROBINSON ELLIS.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

King Horn, Floris and Blaunchflur, The Assumption of Our Lady. First edited in 1866 by the Rev. J. Rawson Lumby, B. D., and now re-edited from the Manuscripts, with Introduction, Notes and Glossary, by George H. McKnight, Ph. D., Ohio State University. (Early English Text Society, Original Series, 14. lviii+171 pp.)

King Horn: A Middle English Romance. Edited from the Manuscripts, by Joseph Hall, M. A., Headmaster of the Hulme Grammar School, Manchester. (Clarendon Press. lv+238 pp.)

It is now more than twenty years since the appearance of Wissmann's elaborate edition of King Horn. In the meantime the poem has received comparatively little attention from scholars, a fact which seems the more remarkable when we consider its antiquity among Middle English Romances, and the unusually large element which it retains of Old English poetic coloring and metre. Yet enough has been done in the general field of Middle English to make a new edition desirable, as would appear by the almost simultaneous publication of two, and the announcement of a third.[1]

The two before us differ from Wissmann, and agree with each other, in that neither attempts to construct one text from the three MSS, but prints all three versions parallel.[2] Of the two, Mr. Hall's texts appear to be more reliable, and his arrangement of them is more convenient.[3] Beyond this, the disparity between the two editions grows wider and wider, not only in compass, but in authority and utility, with the advantage, it must be said, clearly on Mr. Hall's side.

But a comparison of the two is perhaps hardly fair, since Professor McKnight, as his preface implies, has prepared his edition for the 'ordinary reader,' not, we are left to infer, for the scholar. In his introduction he has condensed in fair proportion the results of various studies of the poem, and barring here and there

---

[1] In Morsbach and Holthausen's series of Old and Middle English Texts.
[2] Dr. Furnivall has superintended this part of Professor McKnight's work.
[3] The latter by mistake prints *te* for *to* in line 591, *dofter* for *doster* in line 265. Printer's mistakes, especially in reference-numbers, swarm in the notes and glossary, and in parts of the introduction the numbering of lines is at hopeless variance with that in the text.

a crudity of style, his presentation is creditable, though hardly characterized by independent judgment.[1]

Less may be said of the notes or the glossary, which are on the whole meagre. The former contain chiefly citations of parallels from Layamon and the romances, many of them borrowed from Wissmann, and not always with acknowledgment. An original comment here and there deserves attention. For example, the three versions generally agree in assigning twelve companions to King Horn, but in one case (Harl. l. 22) we read: 'tweye feren he hadde'. The editor remarks that this text 'here lacks one of the archaic features of the story, referring to only two companions.' But four lines further the same scribe shows unquestionably that when he wrote 'tweye' he was thinking 'twelue', a number which he explicitly mentions, in designation of Horn's companions, in lines 177, 521, 529, and 1434. Professor McKnight finds the poet inconsistent in speaking of a 'grene' as the scene of events which take place 'at Christenmesse'. But 'grene' was even thus early applicable the year round to a grassy level used for any performance requiring extensive room, as in Havelok 2828, where the poet mentions that near Lincoln there was such 'a grene, þat þare is yete als y wene.' In his note on line 27 the editor unaccountably confuses reflexive with impersonal verbs.

In the glossary, compound verbs are entered under the simple form with misleading effect, thus: 'Drinke, v. drink; infin. adrinke.' 'Drinke' and 'adrinke' are distinct words with distinct meanings. Yet with this arrangement once proposed, why are 'awreke' and 'wreke', with almost identical meanings, glossed separately? And if the editor aims to condense his matter, why, in the name of the ordinary reader, give eight variant spellings of Babylon ranging through 'Babyloyne' and 'babyloyne,' or why

---

[1] The same is generally true of his work on Floris and Blauncheflur and the Assumption. The former is based chiefly on the studies by Herzog and Hausknecht, and the latter upon those by Horstmann and Gierth. Neither quotation marks nor acknowledgment appear in certain cases where convention would require them. For example:

Hausknecht (p. 34): 'Sondern beide Bearbeitungen, Cantare and Filocolo, gehen auf eine ältere gemeinsame Quelle zurück. Diese italienische—oder franco-italienische—Bearbeitung, die zwar wesentliche Verschiedenheiten von dem Cantare in seiner jetzigen Gestaltung kaum hatte, muss in manchen Punkten doch noch ausführlicher und vollständiger gewesen, und an einzelnen Stellen der französischen Ueberlieferung noch näher gestanden haben als das Cantare.'

McKnight (p. xxxvi): 'Rather the two versions go back to a common source. This Italian, or Franco-Italian, version, which probably had no differences of real moment from the Cantare in its present form, must in many points have been more ample and complete, and in individual instances nearer the French tradition, than the Cantare is.'

Hausknecht's edition of Floris at no point receives sufficient credit from the editor. Three of the four MSS of Floris are printed (Auchinleck is omitted), and three of the five older versions of the Assumption (Cambridge Gg 4. 27, 2, British Museum Add. 10036, and a part of Harleian 2382.

a list of seven references to the text under the auxiliary 'con' which are repeated in full under the variant 'gan'? But such profusion is only spasmodic, and the glossary lays no claim to completeness.

The rather impressive dimensions of Mr. Hall's edition may be indicated thus: The introduction occupies 56 pages: the three texts, 89: the notes, 86, all closely printed: and the glossary, 45; to which add a reprint of the later version, Horn Childe. Throughout the work, where condensation is possible it has been effected, even in some cases to the point of hardness and obscurity. The introduction contains, with other matter, a new and exhaustive study of the phonology, a study of the inflections, a re-examination of the MSS, which yields a much more reasonable stemma than Wissmann's, and a new theory of origin to the effect that the legend was originally Celtic, but was appropriated by an English poet. In its very brief form of statement this theory is hardly convincing.

The notes are quite the most extensive of any with which a Middle English text has yet been provided. Thus the custom of sending young noblemen to be educated with the prince is illustrated in a note which exceeds the limits of a crowded page. Upwards of a dozen illustrations are cited, ranging from Asser through Geoffrey of Monmouth, Ordericus Vitalis, romances English and French, to records of the custom at the English court in 1474, and interspersed with citations directing the student to records of similar practices among the Celts and the Germans. At least ten other notes on customs or devices of romance assume an equal proportion, nor do the elucidations fall off in number and usefulness at any point. Such abundance is certain to be criticized by more casual observers as overwhelming and altogether disproportionate. It should be remembered, however, that, in a field so ill-supplied with works of general reference, a note ought if possible to realize a twofold purpose, serving as an elucidation not merely of the passage to which it is appended, but also, in so far as time, space, and the skill of the editor permit, of similar passages in other texts. However, the most hurried reader need not feel oppressed by the length of Mr. Hall's commentary, for it is so arranged that one may easily select according to the needs of the moment, and pass over the rest. It thus becomes a repository where in time of need many a student may find already gathered what he must otherwise be at great pains to collect, or go without. The glossary is as full and serviceable as the notes; in fact, the entire work seems to represent years of diligent and careful accumulation, and even surpasses the high standard which Mr. Hall had already set in his edition of Minot.

It may seem, indeed, like a rich man's avarice to ask for more. Yet if one were to point out the principal defect of the edition he might find it to be one of temperament, and perhaps could best describe it by saying that the work is not at important

moments sufficiently genial. That is to say, the editor with all his diligence seldom betrays enthusiasm for his work, or reveals a consciousness that he is dealing with a work of art whose excellence, however limited, owes something to the English literature of preceding centuries, and forecasts now and then the glory of English literature in centuries to come. Without attempting more than an illustration, it may be said that the spirit of the sea which asserts itself in the poem is distinctly national, and appears often in the early period. Horn's remarkable apostrophe to his ship, which he bids carry his greetings to his mother, suggests instances in the early poetry in which the ship is thought of as animated.[1]

Apropos of the couplet, 'Of his feire siȝte Al þe bur gan liȝte' (K. H. 385, 386) the editor remarks that such characterization of masculine beauty is quite unique, but cites similar descriptions of women in Middle English. It seems worth while to notice the great power of this image revealed by Shakespeare in Romeo and Juliet (5. 3. 85): 'Her beauty makes This vault a feasting presence full of light;' and by Spenser in Faerie Queen (1. 3. 4):

> Her angel's face,
> As the great eye of Heaven, shyned bright,
> And made a sunshine in the shady place.[2]

It seems unfortunate that the phonology of each of the three texts was not treated separately, rather than run together in its present somewhat confused form. The fact that the oldest and purest text differs quite decidedly in dialect from the others, renders this the more desirable. The glossary is insufficiently supplied with cross-references, nor is it apparent by what rule the editor has included or omitted the etymologies of the words defined. The absence of the bibliography which he was in a position to compile is much to be regretted, as is also the fact that he has substituted for Sievers' standard classification of ablaut verbs one which is almost entirely unfamiliar.

As already intimated, Mr. Hall's edition will hardly meet the approval of those whose enlightened practice it is to declaim against an abundance of annotation, and even to deplore the

---

[1] See Andreas 267, 446, 448, 513, 496. The Andreas contains lines not unlike the formula, 'be se bigan to flowe,: horn childe to rowe' (K. H. 117, 118); cf. And. 258. The English poet's love of the sea is manifest in nearly all modern times.

[2] Cf. Rom. and Jul. 2. 2. 3: 'It is the east and Juliet is the sun;' Sartor Resartus 2. 5, near the end, where Blumine is called 'a star, all fire and humid softness, a very light-ray incarnate.' A further example in Middle English is in Böddeker's Altenglische Dichtungen, Weltliche Lieder, 10. 23: 'Hire lure lumes liht Ase a launterne a nyht.' Compare old English Juliana 166:

> Mēn se swētesta sunnan scīma,
> Juliana! hwæt, pū glæm hafast,
> Ginfæste giofe, geoguðhādes blæd!

Cf. also Juliana 229.

necessity of any commentary at all. Such protest has a way of making itself appear reasonable and just, and one important office of such thorough work as this is to show the error upon which it rests. For, after all, the question is not one of the quantity of elucidation, but of its quality. A very little bad editing is too much. But if an editor's acquaintance with his text enables him to give as richly and abundantly as Mr. Hall has done, or even more abundantly still, every student and reader—however ordinary—has more reason for gratulation than complaint.[1]

<div style="text-align:right">

Y<small>ALE</small> U<small>NIVERSITY.</small>   C<small>HARLES</small> G<small>ROSVENOR</small> O<small>SGOOD.</small>

</div>

Lexicon Plautinum. Conscripsit G<small>ONZALEZ</small> L<small>ODGE</small>, Vol. I. Fasc. I. A-ALIUS. Lipsiae, B. Teubner, MCMI.

There is the same good reason for printing a special lexicon as for printing a critical *apparatus* to a classical author in Latin; the technical vocabulary necessary thereto is of narrow range and capable of expressing much in little. Life seems all too short for the presentation of technical matters in the grammatically complete and rhetorically elegant long hand of the spoken tongues. Now learning babbles in a dozen voices, and some turn fond eyes backward to the unity that was before this Babel, when Latin was the common technical language. Perhaps we shall again return to this when the nations resort to a common coinage, as indeed the Latin races have done already.

From patriotic considerations we may regret that Mr. Lodge's Lexicon is "made in Germany", and introduced with a German preface, but the friends of productive scholarship in this country, whether regulars or mugwumps in their partisan convictions, will readily grasp the politico-economic condition that is responsible for a *Vorbemerkung* in lieu of a 'foreword'.

The first instalment of the Lexicon Plautinum runs into the word *alius* and fills 96 pages. On this scale the finished volume will yield between 1500 and 2000 double-column lexicon-octavo pages. No date is announced for the completion of the work, but a dozen years at the least may be hazarded as a guess.

In the light of considerations as entirely material as these it is clear that the Lexicon Plautinum is a tremendous undertaking.

---

[1] Since this review was written another work on King Horn has appeared as the fourth number of Kieler Studien zur englischen Philologie, edited by Professor Holthausen. It is written by Otto Hartenstein, and entitled Studien zur Hornsage; mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der anglonormannischen Dichtung vom wackern Ritter Horn und mit einer Hornbibliographie versehen. The bibliography, which appears to be exhaustive, is the most valuable part of the work. For the rest it is a resume of the important investigations and theories dealing with the legend of Horn, and should be useful chiefly as a means of orientation in the subject.

No colleague of Mr. Lodge can invidiously construe the assertion
that, in undertaking to confer upon scholarship a complete control
of the Plautine corpus, he is engaged upon the most laborious
and most valuable single contribution to classical philology ever
essayed by an American Latinist.

Not a little highly suggestive work in Latin syntax has already
been published by American scholars, and still more, it is generally
understood, is in the air, if not already on the press.   But there
are fashions in syntax.   It may be attacked from the point of view
of linguistic palaeontology, or syntactical phenomena may be ana-
lyzed psychologically.   A German scholar fired by the splendid
regularity and beautiful precession of the phonetic equinoxes,
has united both these points of view in a phlogistic theory of the
subjunctive as the invariable polemic mood of the (Roman) soul;
and not yet has the gentle, reconciling whisper of a peacemaker
suggested that the moods of postulation and expostulation are
psychologically one.

Historical syntax has yet its word of insistence to urge, viz.:
that we must earnestly seek the archaic (and real) native view
of the Greeks and Romans.   In this field Mr. Lodge, as the co-
worker of Mr. Gildersleeve, has already rendered excellent service
by his share in their joint Latin grammar.

Mr. Lodge now proposes to furnish a control of Plautus that
must survive, in part, at least, every possible change of fashion.
He has set himself to account for the *ipsissima uerba* of the Plautus
manuscripts, variant readings and all: and these are eternal
verities.   Besides, he is citing the conjectural readings that have
been received into the great modern editions of Ussing; of Ritschl
and his great co-workers, Loewe, Goetz and Schoell; of the two
latter in their *editio minor (nimisque multo melior)*; and of Leo:
and conjectural readings are of the things that perish.

When a scholar undertakes a self-denying piece of work like this
it were ungracious to challenge his point of view.   Mr. Lodge
might more have pleased one with a word index; another with
a concordance after the manner, let us say, of Bartlett's con-
cordance to Shakespeare; much might also be said in favor of a
scheme that should reveal the metrical status of every word.
The omission of conjectural readings, or even of manuscript
variants, and the adherence to a good modern text might be
recommended by another.   All these methods of solving his
problem were considered and waived by Mr. Lodge, and to press
them now is beside the mark.

All schools of syntacticians must feel grateful for the new
means of control Mr. Lodge is offering for Plautus.   It would be
difficult to exaggerate the importance for syntax of the large body
of colloquial Latin presented by the Plautine corpus, a full century
and a half before the letters of Cicero; and Deecke's protest
against the overappreciation of Plautine syntax, cited with appro-
bation by Lebreton in his Études sur la Langue et la Grammaire

de Cicéron, p. v, would seem to reflect a moment when Deecke the tired schoolmaster held the whip hand over Deecke the great investigator and scholar.

How widely and how minutely Mr. Lodge has conceived his problem, as regards forms (and incidentally textual criticism), definition and syntax, will appear from a glance at the rubric under which he prints the 5-column article devoted to *accipio*, viz.: *L Forma . . . II significatio* A. *de hominibus* 1. *in domum, hospitio, ad se accipere* . . . 2. *addito supplemento* a. *abl. modi:* . . . b. *aduerbio* . . . c. *additur locus* . . . 3. *term. techn. cum dat.* B. *de rebus.* 1. *res non molestas accipere*: a. . . . b. [pronoun objects] . . . 2. *similiter; condicionem, laetitiam, sim.:* . . . 3. *res molestas accipere:* . . . 4. = *suscipere* . . . 5. *absolute, de rebus* . . . 6. a. *seq. praepp: ab:* . . . *ad:* . . . *ex:* . . . b. *addito adv. . . .* c. *aliae locutiones:* . . . 7. *tropice* a. = *audire . . . apponitur interr. obl. uel infin.* . . . b. = *intellegere.* . . . C. *acceptus, adiectivum:* . . .

Should one feel inclined to challenge this classification a comparison with the rubric of the article *accipio* in the new Thesaurus will reveal no direct imitation on Mr. Lodge's part, but rather a thorough independence within the limits of the general lexicographical fashion that may be regarded as canonical for our time.

It should always be borne in mind that classification, however delightful a mental exercise, is but a concession to the inherent mental shortcomings of the human being. Hardly any two will agree where it is necessary to stop in classification. In the Thesaurus rubric, under the objects of *accipio* (II) we find a division *res incorporales*, further subdivided into a. *commoda* . . . b. *incommoda* . . . c. *indifferentia* . . . . It would seem to require special powers of divination to turn up c if one is searching for *nuntium, cognomen* . . . *accipere*, but to turn to a for *fidem* ('pledge'), *uitam, salutem* ('greetings') *tutelam* ('guardianship'), *clientelas, bellum* (i. e. *imperium belli*), *aestimatio* (-*nem*) . . . *accipere.* One is reminded of an old division of the human race into a. saints . . . , b. sinners . . . , c. the Beecher family.

In finding *infortunium* . . . *accipito* (Mi. 866) and *supplicium* . . . *accipere* (Ci. 456) to cite under his no. 3 Mr. Lodge neatly scores off the Thesaurus which cites Terence as the earliest author for *incommoda accipere.* Again on p. 13, in defining *abi* by *indignationis uel laudis particula*, Mr. Lodge surpasses in clearness the Thesaurus (I, col. 66 *sq.*) which rubricates the same usage under *formulae in comoedia tritae* with the subdivisions *cum improbatione* . . . *cum laude.* Mr. Lodge's classification under this rubric of *abi* in Mo. 585, which can hardly be less than a fervent and reiterated 'do go away', may be questioned, and Mo. 569 is also not a clear close for interjectional *abi.*

The Lexicon Plautinum also seems in error when it rubricates Truc. 749, *hic ratio accepti scribitur*, under no. 1. and Mo. 304,

ratio accepti atque expensi inter nos conuenit, under no. 5. The Thesaurus correctly cites both passages under the substantive *acceptum:* neither Lexicon nor Thesaurus clearly shows that *accepti* in both cases is the technical "credit" of the bookkeeper.

Any one who has ever corrected proof sheets even moderately full of citations must know their enormous liability to error. But, however excusable misprints may be, psychologically considered, they greatly impair the value of lexical work. It is one advantage of the concordance over the lexicon, and perhaps over the bare word index, that the typographical conditions of the concordance are more favorable to the avoidance of errors.

Only a minute and intimate use of the Lexicon Plautinum could reveal its strength or weakness in this regard. The proof-readers of so important a means of control ought to verify every citation. In view of the enormity of this task, perhaps the heads of the larger Latin seminaries in our American Universities might arrange with Mr. Lodge to get competent and responsible members of their student corps to undertake to verify, say, one galley-slip, each. Thus in two or three days an entire fascicle might be verified by joint efforts, thus saving the enormous labor of weeks to one man.

Passing glimpses disclose the presence of typographical errors in the extant fascicle. Under *accipio* II. A. 1st paragraph Mo. 318 reads *non . . . accipient* for *nos . . . ac.*; on p. 96, col. 1, two lines from the bottom *similia . . .* Mo. 126 should read *similis . . .* Mo. 128.

Errors of complete omission will not reveal themselves to any verification, however minute, but in turning up the thirty references under *aliud* it has been noted that Ps. 370 (. . .), 458 should be corrected to Ps. 370 (. . .), Tri. 458.

This notice must not be brought to a close without an expression of fervent gratitude to Mr. Lodge from one who expects to derive great profit from his self-denying labors, and who is keenly sensible of the magnitude of his undertaking. Let us hope that the Lexicon Plautinum will be an earnest of similar work yet to come from American scholarship. Others, perhaps, inspired by the possibility that the financial burden of such publications may be undertaken in future by the Carnegie Institute, may fall into line and direct their energies to work of lasting value.

Every one must be aware that the Harvard Oriental Series is publishing work of very solid value in that field. Yet the Orientalists are but a feeble band, numerically considered. The classical philologians have not published a corresponding amount of solid work, but there exists no similar endowment for classical publication.

An exception may be made in favor of the Yale Bicentennial publications. With the expense of publication assured, there came forth a large number of works of solid import: so fructifying was financial confidence. Similarly we might expect that a general

endowment fund for classical publication would bring forward those of our scholars who work because they must, and so save to solid investigation the stores of energy now diverted to text-book (re)production, barren for any but the publishers. To such an endowment works like Mr. Smyth's 'Ionic Dialect' and Mr. Lodge's 'Lexicon Plautinum' would turn as to their "ONLIE BEGETTER."   E. W. FAY.

Zur Entzifferung der Ṣafâ-Inschriften. Von ENNO LITTMANN. Leipzig, 1901. Pp. ix, 76.

The district bordering upon the lava plateau of Es-Ṣafâ in Central Syria, south-east of Damascus, abounds with inscriptions rudely carved upon the rocks in a character resembling the South Arabian and Old Ethiopic alphabets. About 400 of these inscriptions were copied by the Count de Vogüé and M. Waddington in 1861–62, and were subsequently published in their great work, La Syrie Centrale (Paris, 1865–77). The first successful attempt to decipher them was made by the well-known French epigraphist, J. Halévy, the results of whose studies appeared in a series of articles in the Journal Asiatique (1877–82) and were later reprinted under the title Essai sur les Inscriptions du Ṣafâ (Paris, 1882). The language of the inscriptions Halévy found to be a North Arabian dialect whose precise affinities were difficult to determine, while the alphabet employed consisted, he thought, of 23 letters corresponding to the Hebrew-Phoenician alphabet of 22 letters, with an additional character representing the Arabic ﻉ. Halévy also explained the general contents of the inscriptions, which are, for the most part, epitaphs with genealogies of the deceased whose memory they are designed to preserve. The celebrated Ethiopic scholar, Franz Praetorius, who reviewed Halévy's book (Lit. Centralblatt, 1883, col. 804–806), gave cordial praise to the excellent work of the French savant, but felt compelled to differ from him in several particulars. He pointed out that a number of characters, considered by Halévy to be merely variants, were really distinct letters, and that the true basis of the Safaitic alphabet was to be found, not in the Hebrew-Phoenician, but in the Arabic alphabet of 28 letters. Several of these letters Praetorius actually identified. For some time the study of the Safaitic inscriptions languished, until MM. Dussaud and Macler published, in their Voyage archéologique au Ṣafâ et dans le Djebel ed-Druz (Paris, 1901), 412 inscriptions of this character. M. Dussaud, in his endeavor to decipher these inscriptions, adheres closely to Halévy's methods and results, overlooking Praetorius' valuable remarks. While, therefore, this work makes available for study a large amount of new material, in the matter of decipherment it cannot be said to mark any advance over Halévy's attempt.

Dr. Littmann, who accompanied the American Archaeological Expedition in Syria, 1899-1900, copied 134 Safaitic inscriptions, which, together with those copied by his predecessors, form the basis of his present work. He subjects the whole material to a new investigation and arrives at most important results. Of the 28 letters of the alphabet he finds that 16 were correctly identified by Halévy and five by Praetorius. The remaining seven letters are identified by Dr. Littmann, whose reasoning is in all points most convincing.

He also gives transcriptions of a number of the inscriptions, with translations and analyses, and adds a brief vocabulary of the texts treated, a Schrifttafel, and six plates of facsimiles. Dr. Littmann has also discovered the only date as yet found in these inscriptions. At the close of one of the inscriptions copied by him (No. 45) occur the words סנת חרב נבט "in the year of the war of the Nabateans", which can only refer to Trajan's campaign in 106 A. D. Dr. Littmann's work marks a decided advance in the decipherment of the Safaitic inscriptions, which now, thanks to his investigations, stands upon safe and solid ground. It is to be hoped that he will continue his studies and throw further light upon this interesting subject.

CHRISTOPHER JOHNSTON.

Tetrevangelium Sanctum iuxta simplicem Syrorum Versionem ad fidem Codicum, Massorae, editionum denuo recognitum, lectionum supellectilem quam conquisiverat PH. ED. PUSEY, A. M. auxit, digessit, edidit GEORGIUS HENRICUS GWILLIAM, S. T. B. (Oxonii, e typographeo Clarendoniano MDCCCCI. 4to, pp. xvi, 608.)

While the Syriac versions form an indispensable instrument for the textual criticism of the Bible, the versions of the New Testament are of much greater value in this respect than those of the Old Testament, as they were made at a relatively earlier period and are based on a text comparatively free from the corruptions and interpolations which have crept into the text of the Old Testament.

Four Syriac versions of the New Testament are known:—I. The Diatessaron, or Harmony of the Four Gospels, of Tatian; II. The Curetonian Version; III. The Sinaitic Version; and IV. The Peshittâ Version.

By some scholars the Diatessaron of Tatian is believed to have been composed in Syriac, at Edessa, about the year 172 A. D., while others hold that it was originally written in Greek and afterwards translated into Syriac. Although the work was highly

esteemed in the early Syriac Church it is now lost. St. Ephrem wrote a commentary upon it of which an Armenian version[1] has been preserved, and in 1888 the late Cardinal Ciasca published an Arabic version of the Diatessaron which is attributed to Abû-el Faraj ibn at-Ṭib.

The Curetonian version is probably to be placed in the interval between the years 150 and 250 A. D. It was published in 1858 from a manuscript, in the British Museum, some pages of which were lacking. Some years later Brugsch found the missing pages, which are now in the Berlin Museum, and they were published in 1872 by the late Dr. William Wright, Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge.[2]

The Sinaitic version, which seems to be of somewhat later date than the Curetonian, was discovered by Mrs. A. Lewis in the Convent of St. Catharine, on Mt. Sinai, and was published by its discoverer in 1894.[3]

While the date of the Peshittâ version of the New Testament cannot be definitely fixed, it was certainly in general use as the authorized text before the end of the 5th century A. D. when the separation of the Eastern and Western Syriac Churches took place, and it then contained, not only the four Gospels, but the Acts, the First Epistle of Peter, the First Epistle of John, the Epistle of James, and the Epistles of Paul. Although later than the other Syriac versions, the Peshittâ has a higher critical value on account of its very faithful and literal rendering of the original. The first edition of the Peshittâ version of the New Testament was published by Widmandstadt, at Vienna, in 1555. This edition has since been frequently republished in whole or in part: in the Polyglot of Paris, 1645; at Leyden, in 1630 by Pococke; in the well-known editions of Gutbir, Schaaf, and Lee; and more recently at Urmia in Persia, and at Mosul in Mesopotamia.[4] But in view of the importance of the subject and of the great progress of Semitic studies in recent years, a critical revision of the published text of the Peshittâ has long been urgently needed.

[1] Published by Moesinger, Vienna, 1876. In 1881, Zahn attempted to restore the Diatessaron on the basis of this work. See also H. Hill and A. Robinson, A Dissertation on the Gospel Commentaries of St. Ephrem the Syrian, Edinburgh, 1896; Harris, Fragments of the Commentary of Ephrem Syrus upon the Diatessaron, London, 1895; Goussen, Apocalypsis Sancti Johannis Versio Sahidica, Leipzig, 1895.

[2] Cureton, Remains of a very ancient Recension of the Gospels, London, 1858; W. Wright, Fragments of the Curetonian Gospels, London, 1872.

[3] Mrs. A. Lewis, The four Gospels in Syriac transcribed from the Syriac palimpsest, Cambridge, 1894. See also, Some pages of the four gospels, Cambridge, 1896; A. Merx, Die vier Kanonischen Evangelien, Berlin, 1897; Holzley, Der neuentdeckte Codex Syrus Sinaiticus, Munich, 1896; A. Bonus, Collatio Codicis Lewisiani rescripti, Oxford, 1896.

[4] The distinguished native Syriac scholar Father Paul Bedjan has, for some years, been engaged in the preparation of a new critical edition of the Peshittâ version of the Old and New Testaments, which is to be printed at Leipzig from the beautiful Syriac types of W. Drugulin.

15

Many years ago the late Philip Edward Pusey, son of the well-known Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford, began to collate ancient manuscripts of the Peshittâ in order to discover how far the traditional text, first published by Widmandstadt and reproduced with little alteration by subsequent editors, might be considered to represent the text prevalent in the ancient Syriac Church. After Mr. Pusey's death the work was continued by Mr. G. H. Gwilliam, in whose hands the critical materials accumulated to such an extent as to necessitate a considerable expansion of the original design. Thus, although Mr. Gwilliam was the final editor, the present volume results from the labors of both scholars. The thorough, and at the same time the arduous, nature of their work may be gathered from the fact that the text of this new critical edition of the Peshittâ Gospels is based on the evidence of no less than forty-two manuscripts proceeding from various localities, and dating from the 5th to the 12th century. All this abundant material has been carefully collated, the results of the numerous collations have been utilized with sound judgment and scholarship, and the whole work is edited with great skill and conscientious accuracy. The investigations of the editors establish the fact that the text of the editio princeps of 1555 is almost identical with that of the most ancient manuscripts. But while the traditional text of the Peshittâ is thus in large measure confirmed, the editors have been able to make valuable emendations in a number of passages where the manuscripts used by Widmandstadt were defective or corrupt. The vocalization follows in the main the Jacobite Massoretic manuscripts, but in the notes the Nestorian Massora is frequently cited. In accordance with the arrangement of the most ancient manuscripts, the text is divided into paragraphs, and the Syriac system of sections and canons, here for the first time given in full, is indicated throughout. A very faithful and literal Latin translation adds greatly to the value of the work. The book is of convenient size, and its typography and general arrangement are excellent. In the Tetrevangelium we have an edition of the Peshittâ Gospels which fully meets the critical requirements of modern scholarship, and the editors have earned the thanks of all biblical scholars for their valuable work.

GABRIEL OUSSANI.

REPORTS.

ROMANIA, Vol. XXIX (1900).

Janvier.

P. Meyer. Notice du Ms. Rawlinson Poetry 241 (Oxford). 84 pages. This manuscript contains copies of the following Old French poems: Proverbes de Boon; La Plainte d'amour; Poème sur l'Amour de dieu et sur la Haine du péché; Dialogue entre l'évêque Saint Julien et son disciple; Miracles de la vierge par Éverard de Gateley; Extraits du Manuel des Péchés; Traduction du Speculum Ecclesiæ; Les Neuf filles du diable; Les Quatre temps de l'an; La Petite philosophie; Le Lunaire de Salomon; and L'Antechrist.

W. A. Neilson. The Purgatory of Cruel Beauties: A Note on the Sources of the Eighth Novel of the Fifth Day of the Decameron. 9 pages. (Bryn Mawr).

G. Huet. La Traduction française des Martins de Maerlant. 11 pages.

Mélanges. F. Lot; G. Paris (bis); Arthur Piaget; Louis Havet.

Comptes rendus. Beiträge zur romanischen Philologie: Festgabe für Gustav Gröber (G. Paris). (Also J. Loth, Note sur Cath Paluc). Albert Stimming, Der anglonormannische Boeve de Haumtone (G. Paris). G. A. Cesareo, Le Origini della Poesia lirica in Italia (A. Jeanroy). C. Decurtins, Rætoromanische Chrestomathie (Jacques Ulrich.)

Périodiques. Zeitschrift für rom. Phil. XXIII, 4, discussion of etymologies (G. Paris). Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Litteraturen, LXXXVIII–CI (S. D. G.).

Chronique. Account of the researches of A. Guesnon and E. Schröder.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 30 titles. King Arthur and the Table Round, by William Navell. The Isopo Laurenziano, by Murray Peabody Brush ("M. Brush nous a donné un excellent travail, intéressant à divers points de vue"). The Technique of the French Alexandrine, by Hugo Paul Thieme. Lois de Guillaume le Conquérant, by John E. Matzke and Ch. Bémont ("Étude fort bien faite").

Avril.

A. Thomas. Étymologies Françaises. 48 pages. The etymologies of fifty-nine words are discussed in his usual careful critical manner.

G. Paris. Sur Huon de Bordeaux. 10 pages.

G. Doncieux. La Chanson du Roi Renaud: Ses Dérivées romanes; Sa Parenté celtique et scandinave. 38 pages. The writer enumerates some sixty French and Provençal versions, as well as eight in the Piedmontese dialect.

Mélanges. Hermann Suchier; A. Thomas; G. Paris; Charles Joret.

Comptes rendus. F.-Georges Mohl, Introduction à la chronologie du latin vulgaire: Le couple roman *lui: lei*, ses origines et son histoire dans les dialectes vulgaires de l'empire romain (Mario Roques). 21 pages. Hermann Suchier, Aucassin und Nicolete, 4te Auflage (G. Paris). Pierce Butler, Legenda aurea, Légende dorée, Golden Legend (P. Meyer). H. Guy, Essai sur la vie et les œuvres littéraires du trouvère Adan de le Hale (A. Jeanroy). Ch. Guerlin de Guer, Essai de dialectologie normande (J. G.).

Périodiques. Revue des langues romanes, 4ᵉ série, t. X, nos. 6–12; 5ᵉ série, t. I, t. II, nos. 1–4 (P. Meyer). Zeitschrift für rom. Phil. XXIV, 1, discussion of etymologies (G. Paris). Literaturblatt für germ. u. rom. Phil., XX (E. M.). Studi glottologici italiani (Mario Roques).

Chronique. Société des anciens textes français. Homenaje á Menéndez Pelayo. Annales de Bretagne. Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 6 titles. The Troubadours at Home, by Justin H. Smith, 2 vols.

Juillet.

O. Densusianu. Sur l'Altération du C latin devant E, I, dans les langues romanes. 13 pages.

Ramón Menéndez Pidal. Etimologías españolas. 46 pages. The etymologies of some seventy-four words are discussed.

F. Lot. Le Roi Hoël de Kerahès, Ohès le vieil barbé, les "Chemins d'Ahès," et la ville de Carhaix. 23 pages.

Paget Toynbee. Benvenuto da Imola and the Iliad and Odyssey. 13 pages. "One of the striking features of the commentary of Benvenuto da Imola on the *Divina Commedia* is the frequency of his references to Homer."

Mélanges. G. Paris; Eugène Ritter; Charles Bonnier; G. Paris (*bis*).

Comptes rendus. F.-G. Mohl, Les origines romanes: Études sur le lexique du latin vulgaire (A. Thomas). Hugo Schuchardt, Romanische Etymologieen (A. Thomas). Gustaf Lené, Les substantifs postverbaux dans la langue française (G. Paris). Rudolf Tobler, Die altprovenzalische Version der "Disticha

Catonis" (P. Meyer). A Vidal et A. Jeanroy, Comptes consulaires d'Albi (P. Meyer). Matteo Bartoli, Ueber eine Studienreise zur Erforschung des Altromanischen Dalmatiens (Mario Roques). V. Henry, Lexique étymologique des termes les plus usuels du breton moderne (A. Thomas). Lettre de M. F.-Geo. Mohl, et réponse de M. Mario Roques.

Chronique. Obituary notices of Charles Revillout, Alexandre Budinszky, Léopold Hervieux, Johann Alton, M. le comte Cais de Pierlas, J.-Fr. Bladé.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 41 titles. Spanish Etymologies, by John D. Fitz-Gerald. Alliteration in Italian, by Robert Longley Taylor. The Lays of Graelent and Lanval and the Story of Wayland, by William Henry Schofield.

Octobre.

A. Longnon. Un Vestige de l'épopée mérovingienne: la Chanson de l'abbé Dagobert. 12 pages. "Grace aux beaux livres de MM. Pio Rajna et Godefroid Kurth, il est désormais impossible de nier que les faits historiques de la période mérovingienne aient donné naissance à un certain nombre de chants épiques."

E. Galtier. Byzantina. 27 pages. Various Old French legends and stories are traced back to Byzantine sources.

P. Meyer. Le Psautier de Lambert le Bègue. 18 pages. With a facsimile of British Museum, Addit. 21114, fo. 7.

C. Salvioni. A Proposito di Amis. 13 pages. Etymological discussion.

Mélanges. Paget Toynbee; Auguste Longnon; Oliver M. Johnston; R. J. Cuervo; Charles Joret.

Comptes rendus. Forschungen zur romanischen Philologie: Festgabe für Hermann Suchier (G. Paris). Charakteristik der germanischen Elemente im Italienischen, von Dr. Wilh. Bruckner (C. J. Cipriani). Le Bestiaire de Philippe de Thaun, p. p. Emmanuel Walberg (G. Paris). Le Chevalier à l'Épée, edited by Edward Cooke Armstrong (G. Paris). Juan Manuel, El libro de los enxiemplos del Conde Lucanor et de Patronio, hrsg. von Hermann Knust u. Adolf Birch-Hirschfeld (María Goyri).

Note de M. F.-Geo. Mohl. J. Loth, Le nom de Carhaix: Réponse de M. Ferdinand Lot.

Périodiques. Studj di Filologia romanza, vol. VIII (P. Meyer). Zeitschrift für rom. Phil. XXIII, 2–3, discussion of etymologies (G. Paris). Zeitschrift für französ. Sprache und Literatur, XIX, 2—XXI, 2 (A. Jeanroy). Bulletin historique et philologique, année 1896 (P. Meyer). Bulletin de la Soc. des anc. textes français, 1899; Sechster Jahresbericht des Instituts für rumän. Sprache zu Leipzig (Mario Roques).

Chronique. Obituary notices of Samuel Berger, L. Petit de Julleville and Gustave Meyer. Dictionnaire général de la langue française, par MM. Ad. Hatzfeld, Arsène Darmesteter et A. Thomas.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 27 titles. The Round Table before Wace, by Arthur C. L. Brown.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM FÜR PHILOLOGIE, Vol. LVII, parts 1, 2.

Pp. 1–7. Ueber eine besondere Bedeutung von γάρ. J. M. Stahl. In Thucydides, III 40, 4, γάρ has a restrictive force: εἰ γὰρ οὗτοι ὀρθῶς ἀπέστησαν, "*Freilich* wenn diese mit gutem Grunde abgefallen sind." Compare III 43, 4; Plat. Crat. 393 C; Aesch. Pers. 462 (Weckl.); Antiph. v. 36; Plat. Legg. 794 C; Dem. XX 117, etc.

Pp. 8–47. Ueber den Verfasser der X libri de Architectura. H. Degering. The first instalment of a long article which examines, and refutes, Ussing's opinion that this work is a forgery of the third or fourth century. This first part discusses the relation of Pliny and Athenaeus to Vitruvius.

Pp. 48–54. Zwei alte Terenzprobleme. F. Schoell. (1) In the sixth line of the prologue to the Heauton Timorumenos *duplex* may have the meaning which διπλοῦς sometimes has; compare Catull. LXVIII 51, duplex Amathusia; Hor. I 6, 7, duplex Ulixes; Ov. Am. I 12, 27. The line implies nothing as to Terence's practice of *contaminatio*, but contains rather a judgment of Terence upon the original play of Menander. In the third line *primum* and *deinde* should be transposed. (2) The text of Andria, 51–2, is hopeless: *liberius* looks like a gloss.

Pp. 55–75. Zu Achilles Tatius. F. Wilhelm. The two discussions in Achilles Tatius about the love of women and the love of boys—I 8, 1–9, and II 35, 3–38 (Hercher)—are modelled on various earlier discussions upon similar themes: Plato (Phaedr., Phaedo, Symp.), Xenophon (Symp.), popular literature (now lost) περὶ ἔρωτος, περὶ κάλλους and περὶ γάμου, Lucian (especially the Ἔρωτες) and Plutarch (Erot.), the Hellenistic elegy, etc.

Pp. 76–136. Kaiser Marcus Salvius Otho. L. Paul. A very long article—excellent but, from its nature, unreportable.

Pp. 137–51. Aus dem zweiten Bande der Amherst Papyri. L. Radermacher. Remarks on some of the classical fragments lately published by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt.

Pp. 152–6. Die Inschrift der Aphaia aus Aegina. M. Fränkel.

Miscellen.—Pp. 157–8. O. Schulthess. Zum I. Strassburger Archilochos-Fragmente. Read εὐφρόν[ης σκότῳ] in the third line.

—Pp. 158–9. L. Radermacher. Dionys. de Lysia p. 32, 12 (p. 496 R). Read τὴν ἐξέτασιν ἐπὶ τῶν, κτλ.—Pp. 159–63. F. Schöll. Zu Pseudo-Sallusts Invectiva.—Pp. 163–5. F. Schöll. Die Verse des 'Vallegius' in der Vita Terentii.—P. 166. K. Zangemeister. Zu Ammianus Marcellinus. In 30, 5 § 19, for *pulserat consuetu* read *fulserat consuete.* The adverb 'consuete' occurs also in Ammianus 23, 2 § 8.—P. 166. G. Knaack. Zu dem sogenannten Lactantius Placidus.—Pp. 167–8. P. v. Winterfeld. Zu Avianus.—Pp. 168–9. K. Zangemeister. Erstarrte Flexion von Ortsnamen im Latein.—Pp. 169–70. K. Zangemeister. SECVS statt SECVNDVS und Aehnliches.—Pp. 170–1. K. Zangemeister. Das stigma in lateinischer Schrift. The sign for 'st' is found in an inscription of the first half of the first century A. D. (=Corp. XIII n. 6948ᵃ). This is apparently the earliest known example of it in Latin writing.—Pp. 171–3. H. Usener. DIVVS ALEXANDER. Johannes Chrysostomos in the twenty-sixth homily on the second epistle to the Corinthians (t. X p. 624ᵃ Montf.) mentions an Alexander who was deified by the Roman senate. This was Alexander Severus, not Alexander the Great; see Aelius Lampridius, c. 63, 'senatus eum in deos rettulit.—Pp. 173–6. L. Ziehen. Das Amphiktyonen-Gesetz vom Jahre 380.

Pp. 177–95. Milch und Honig. H. Usener. On the use of milk and honey in the baptismal rites of the early Roman church. This must have been due to the old heathen ideas of heaven, such, for example, as underlay the worship of Dionysus.

Pp. 196–204. De fragmentis scriptorum apud Nonium servatis. W. M. Lindsay. The various books from which Nonius quotes are always cited in the same order. Moreover, within the single books of the Compendiosa Doctrina the passages cited seem to keep the same order as in their original setting. It is thus possible to determine the true order of several of the fragments which he has preserved, fragments, for example, of Lucilius, Sisenna and Varro.

Pp. 205–30. Hellenistische Studien. G. Knaack. I. A detailed study of the story of Scylla daughter of Nisus.

Pp. 231–51. Die Epochen in Varros Werk De gente populi Romani. H. Peter. Virgil's combination of the Etruscan theory of 'saecula' with the theory of the 'magnus annus,' at the completion of which a new era would begin, seems to have been derived from Varro.

Pp. 252–58. Zu der Inschrift der Aphaia auf Aegina. A. Furtwängler. A reply to an article by M. Fränkel (Rh. Mus. LVII, pp. 152–6). The οἶκος of the inscription was a temple, not a "dépendence" of a temple of Artemis, as Fränkel has maintained.

Pp. 259–64. Legionen des Orient auf Grund der Notitia dignitatum. K. Mangold.

Pp. 265-77. ΤΥΦΛΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ. C. Fries. The tradition of the blindness of Demodocus, Homer, the Chian singer of the Delian hymn, Thamyris, etc., is perhaps due to Egyptian influence.

Pp. 278-84. Ueber eine Scene des euripideischen Orestes. L. Radermacher. The lively scene which tells of the disappearance of Helen and the capture of Hermione may have been modeled on the adventure of Hercules with Busiris (Apollod. II 5, 11).

Pp. 285-300. Herkulanensische Bruchstücke einer Geschichte des Sokrates und seiner Schule. W. Crönert.

Pp. 301-10. Ländliches Leben bei Homer und im deutschen Mittelalter. M. Siebourg. The scenes of country life which Hephaestus portrayed on the Shield of Achilles are illustrated from certain legal documents which refer to country life in medieval Germany.

Miscellen.—Pp. 311-2. G. Wörpel. Ad libellum περὶ ὕψους. Defends the reading μοι δοκῶ, pag. 4, 10 (ed. Jahn-Vahlen); compare Strabo X. p. 452; Xen. Cyrop. V 4, 37; Plotin. Enn. I 6, 8; etc.— Pp. 312-14. F. Schöll. Vir bonus dicendi peritus. Protests against O. Ribbeck's interpretation of this phrase, "ein guter Mann, Sohn Marcus, ist des Wortes mächtig," also against L. Radermacher's assumption that Cato derived it from Diogenes of Babylon.—Pp. 315-16. Atticaster. Böotisches. Notes on two epigrams published B. C. H. XXIV, p. 70, and Sitzungsb. d. Berl. Akad. 1901, I p. 905.—Pp. 316-18. M. Ihm. Zu lateinischen Inschriften.—P. 318. E. Wölfflin. Die Reitercenturien des Tarquinius Priscus.—Pp. 318-20. E. Lattes. Zu den etruskischen Monatsnamen und Zahlwörtern.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE.   WILFRED P. MUSTARD.

REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE, Vol. XXV.

No. 1.

1. Pp. 1-42. Third article of B. Haussoullier on the Seleucidae and the temple of Didymean Apollo. Several inscriptions, some of them discovered by the author and hitherto unpublished, are utilized in a very able and interesting investigation of the subject treated in the previous articles (Rev. de Phil. XXIV, pp. 243-271, 316-332).

2. Pp. 43-5. J. L. denies that dum = "while" (tandis que) can be construed with the subjunctive. He examines the passages that might seem to support this construction. He thinks that Phaedrus may have written (I. 4, 2 f.): Canis, per flumen, carnem dum ferret, natans, | lympharum etc.; that is natans per flumen, dum ferret (= ut auferret).

3. Pp. 45–9. J. L. emends eight passages of Theognis.

4. Pp. 50–65. W. M. Lindsay publishes, with some changes, a collation of the Cambridge MS of the fourth book of Nonius, left in the papers of the late J. H. Onions.

5. Pp. 66–71. G. Rodier offers conjectures on twenty-seven passages of Alexander Aphrodisiensis de Fato.

6. Pp. 72–81. Book Notices. 1) G. M. Edwards, The Hellenica of Xenophon, Books I and II. Cambridge, 1899. Georges Vatelot mentions this work very favorably. 2) Xenophontis expeditio Cyri. Recensuit Guilelmus Gemoll. Editio maior. Lipsiae, 1899. Commended by Georges Vatelot, who proposes a few improvements. 3) Albert Wellauer. Étude sur la Fête des Panathénées. Lausanne, 1899. G. Vatelot analyzes this doctor dissertation, finding it a valuable contribution to the subject, and suggesting several improvements. 4) Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica. Iterum edidit Adolphus Roemer. Leipzig, 1899. Albert Martin gives a brief analysis and commends the changes from the first edition. 5) De nominibus bucolicis scripsit Carolus Wendel. Leipzig, 1900. Briefly analyzed by A. M. who finds in it no addition to our knowledge. 6) Dionysii Halicarnasei opuscula, Ediderunt H. Usener et L. Radermacher. Leipzig, 1899. Highly praised by Albert Martin. 7) Catalogus codicum astrologorum Graecorum. II. Codices Venetos descripserunt G. Kroll et A. Olivieri. Accedunt fragmenta primum edita a Boll, Cumont, Kroll, Olivieri. Bruxelles, 1900. Analysis by Albert Martin. 8) Ettore Pais. Storia di Roma. Vol. I, parte II. Torino, 1899. Philippe Fabia finds this part as praiseworthy as the first. The work is critical and overthrows many old structures. 9) Schüler-Kommentar zu Ciceros Rede für L. Murena, von Hermann Nohl. Leipzig, 1900. Mentioned by R. Harmand, who finds the notes rather few and brief. 10) Ciceros Ausgewählte Reden, erklärt von Karl Halm, II Band. Rede gegen Q. Caecilius, Anklage-Rede gegen C. Verres, IV et V.—10te Auflage, besorgt von G. Laubmann. Berlin, (1900?). R. Harmand finds the commentary excellent, but regrets some defects. 11) Gai Iuli Caesaris commentariorum de bello civili liber tertius, by A. G. Peskett, Cambridge, 1900. R. Harmand considers this a good work, but makes some adverse criticisms. 12) Giovanni Oberziner. Le guerre di Augusto contro i popoli alpini. Roma, 1900. Highly praised by Philippe Fabia, who regrets that the book is not attractive in style nor make up, and that the title is not sufficiently comprehensive. 13) Tacite, Oeuvres complètes, annotées par MM. Constans et Girbal. Paris, 1893–99. H. Bornecque says "Dans l'ensemble, c'est la meilleure édition de Tacite que nous possédions." 14) Alcide Macé. Essai sur Suétone. Paris, 1900. This doctor dissertation of 450 pages is highly commended by Philippe Fabia. 15) The Establishment and Extension of the Law of Turneysen and Havet, by Lionel

Horton-Smith. Louis Duvau (who justly thinks the name of Havet should precede in the name of the law) finds nothing essentially new in this work, and rejects the conclusion arrived at in the excursus on 'haud'.

16. Pp. 81-4. List of books received.

No. 2.

1. Pp. 85-8. The games in honor of the proconsul Q. Mucius Scaevola, by P. Foucart. An interesting discussion based upon some inscriptions, which, though mutilated, the author ingeniously restores by comparison.

2. Pp. 89-91. The family of Herodes Atticus. By P. Foucart. Discussion of a few Greek inscriptions that bear on the subject.

3. Pp. 92-3. Th. Kakridis writes a critical note on Plaut. As. 99 f.

4. Pp. 94-101. Critical discussion of eight passages of Ter. Phormio, by Louis Havet.

5. Pp. 102-9. Plato and the origin of minerals, by F. de Mély. The author examines Plat. Tim. 354 c, 365-9, and shows that Plato, for want of an established terminology, used words, such as ὕδωρ, in senses that have been misunderstood. Mély, who is preparing a work on Greek science, ascribes the genesis of the science of Mineralogy to Plato.

6. P. 109. Émile Chatelain emends Plin. N. H. VIII, 165.

7. Pp. 110-123. Language and style of Victor of Vita, by F. Ferrère. In this article peculiar forms and meanings of words are illustrated; in a second article the syntax is to receive attention. It is pointed out that many of the provincialisms of Africa are found also in other provinces; still it is not denied that there is an "Africitas."

8. Pp. 123-4. Bruno Keil publishes a note on the town of Baris mentioned in one of the inscriptions used by Haussoullier in his articles on the temple of Didymean Apollo. He uses the facts deduced to throw light on Sacri Sermones of Aelius Aristides.

9. Pp. 125-45. The Seleucidae and the temple of Didymean Apollo (fourth article), by B. Haussoullier. By means of a papyrus and some inscriptions (one unpublished) the author, with great learning and ingenuity, makes very important contribution to the confused history of Seleucus II (Callinicus).

10. Pp. 146-51. A new milestone of Lydia, by B. Haussoullier. The stone, now in the mosque at Koz-bounar, marked the eleventh mile from Ephesus, and has three other inscriptions, one of which contains the name of Fl. Cl. Dulcitius, Proconsul, somewhat mutilated. Haussoullier gives an account of this man, and fixes the dates of the inscriptions.

11. Pp. 152–62. Book Notices. 1) Table analytique des dix premiers volumes des Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris, par Émile Ernault. Paris, 1900. L. D. pronounces this carefully prepared table an indispensable complement of the Memoires themselves. 2) H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, La civilisation des Celtes et celle de l'épopée homérique. Paris, 1899. Louis Duvau gives an appreciative account of this work, which possesses a psychological rather than a historical interest, and is more instructive to a reader of Caesar than of Homer. 3) Omero. L'Iliade commentata da C. O. Zuretti, vol. II, libri V–VIII. Torino, 1900. Highly commended by E. Chambry, who finds some insignificant faults. 4) The Odyssey of Homer. Book XI edited with Introduction, Notes and Appendices by J. A. Nairn. Cambridge, 1900. Very favorable notice by E. Chambry. 5) The Ethics of Aristotle, edited with an introduction and notes by J. Burnet. London, 1900. G. Rodier makes favorable comments on this work as a whole, and then adds that some exceptions must be taken. These he illustrates by criticizing the treatment of thirty-two passages of the first book. 6) Plutarque, de la Musique, Περὶ Μουσικῆς, édition critique et explicative, par H. Weil et Th. Reinach. Paris, 1900. Louis Laloy describes this book in highly appreciative terms, and objects to only one emendation. 7) Favonii Eulogii Disputatio de Somnio Scipionis ed. Alfred Holder. Leipzig, 1901. Brief and favorable notice by G. Rodier.

12. Pp. 162–4. List of books received.

No. 3.

1. Pp. 165–88. The renting of the sacred domain of Zeus Temenites (Amorgos), by J. Delamarre. Very able and interesting critical discussion of an inscription of Amorgos, which had been previously published and discussed by others. The author, after a careful examination of the original in Amorgos, has been enabled to make many corrections and practically to restore nearly the entire inscription.

2. Pp. 189–96. Discovery of a fragment of a manuscript of Horace, by Pontus Sjöbeck. The author found in the University of Lund a parchment containing Hor. Od. III *4*, vv. 12–65, with marginal scholia and interlinear notes, all of which he publishes.

3. Pp. 197–219. Syntactical compounds and the Porsonic law in Greek iambic trimeters, by G. Dottin. It is not possible to compress into a brief space the substance of this elaborate investigation abounding in statistics. The object of the article is not to account for seeming violations of Porson's rule, but by means of these to throw light on the question of syntactical compounds or closely united groups of words. The article is preliminary to a work the author is preparing on the separation of words in the iambic trimeter.

4. Pp. 220–24. Plaut. Aul. 3–8, by J. Chauvin. The passage and the various emendations are discussed, and more satisfactory emendations proposed. A note on vv. 10–12 is added.

5.' Pp. 225-31. Critical discussion of six passages of Ter. Phormio by Louis Havet.

6 Pp. 232-4. R. Cahen defends and explains the "archetype" reading, tantum sit causa timendi, in Ov. Met. IX. 557.

7. Pp. 235-52. Apropos of a recent edition of Thucydides, by Daniel Serruys. The edition of H. S. Jones in the Scriptorum classicorum bibliotheca Oxoniensis is reviewed in the main favorably, but exception taken to his views concerning the MSS. The author then discusses at some length the whole subject of the tradition of Thucydides, giving numerous collations by way of illustration.

8. Pp. 253-60. Corrections of the text of Gregorius Nazianzenus, by A. Misier. Twenty odd passages emended, some in the Sermons, others in the Letters.

9. Pp. 261-82. Book Notices. 1) Annales de la Faculté des Lettres de Bordeaux et Revue des Universités du Midi. Table des tomes I à XX (1879-98), par Eugène Bouvy. Bordeaux; Paris. Briefly mentioned by L. D. The title sufficiently describes the work. 2) H. Francotte. L'Industrie dans la Grèce ancienne, tome I. Bruxelles, 1900. Analyzed at some length by Gustave Lefebure, who, recognizing the great value of the work in many respects, still takes issue with some of its leading doctrines. 3) Euripides Iphigenia auf Tauris herausgegeben von Dr. Siegfried Reiter. Leipzig, 1900. Reviewed by E. Chambry. The work is intended for pupils and for private reading, but will be found not only excellent for these, but very useful to scholars. 4) Aristote. Traité de l'âme, traduit et annoté par G. Rodier. Paris, 1900. Jules Lebreton, though hesitating to accept some few details, commends this work highly. It is rather philosophical than philological. 5) Aristotelis qui fertur de Melisso Xenophane Gorgia libellus, edidit Hermannus Diels. Berlin, 1900. Brief and favorable mention by Jules Lebreton. 6) Lucianus. Recognovit Iulius Sommerbrodt. Vol. III. Berlin, 1899. E. Chambry finds this critical work very important, but condemns some of the emendations as being rash and unnecessary—a fault which he ascribes to the influence of "le téméraire Cobet." 7) Die Paraphrase des Enteknios zu Oppians Kynegetika von Otto Tüselmann. Briefly mentioned by Albert Martin. The work, so far as books II and III are concerned, is an editio princeps. The reviewer, commending the work, calls the author's attention to a MS which might have proved useful. 8) Alf. Franke, De Pallada epigrammatographo. Leipzig, 1899. Also Hugo Stadtmüller, Anthologia graeca epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea, Vol. II, pars prior. Leipzig, 1899. Albert Martin notices these two works together. The former he pronounces very erudite and bestows equal praise upon the latter, with one slight exception. 9) Johannes Raeder, De Theodoreti Graecarum affectionum curatione quaestiones criticae. Hauniae, 1900. Briefly described by A. M. 10) Ernst Berger, Stylistique latine, remaniée par

MM. Max Bonnet et Ferdinand Gache, 3ᵉ édition. Paris, 1900. R. Harmand considers this an originally excellent work made still better. 11) The Captivi of Plautus edited with notes etc., by G. E. Barber. Boston, 1900. A. Cartault describes the work. 12) Q. Ennio. I frammenti degli Annali editi e illustrati da Luigi Valmaggi. Torino, 1900. Favorably mentioned by A. C. 13) Caroli Pascal. Commentationes Vergilianae, 1900, Mediolani-Panormi. A. Cartault recognizes the ingenuity and erudition of the author, but rejects and combats his conclusions. 14) Le liriche di Orazio, commentate da Vincenzo Ussani, volume I. Gli Epodi, 1° libro delle Odi. Torino, 1900. R. Harmand finds some merits and many faults. 15) Σπ. Βάσης. Παρατηρήσεις εἰς Προπερτίου ποιήματα ('Αθηνᾶ, XII. 3 pp. 318–43). 'Αθήνησιν, 1900. A. Cartault commends this article, but finds a few inadmissible things. 16) P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium libri quinque. Revisione del testo e commento a cura di Enrico Cocchia. Torino, 1900. Mentioned very unfavorably by A. C. 17) R. Ehwald. Exegetischer Kommentar zur XIV. Heroide Ovids (Programm, Gotha Gymnas.). Gotha, 1900. Mentioned favorably by A. Cartault, who proposes a few corrections. 18) P. Papini Stati Silvae Krohni copiis usus edidit Alfredus Klotz. Lipsiae, 1900. A. Cartault sums up the results of this critical work, which he considers epoch-making in the history of the text of Statius, but not by any means final. He discusses a number of points in which he does not agree with Klotz. 19) D. Junii Juvenalis Saturae con note di Enrico Cesaro. Libro I, Satira I. Messina, 1900. A. C. says that this work is practically a reproduction of the excellent edition of Friedländer with some useless additions. 20) Ciceros ausgewählte Reden, erklärt von K. Halm. Dritter Band. Vierzehnte Auflage besorgt von G. Laubmann. Berlin, 1900. Henri Bornecque sais "il est inutile, je crois, de faire l'éloge de cette édition de Cicéron, que les éditeurs de tous les pays imitent ou copient, souvent sans le dire." 21) Cicéron. De Oratore I, texto riveduto ed annotato da Antonio Cima. 2ᵃ Edizione. Turin, 1900. Henri Bornecque praises this work. 22) L. Fighiera. La lingua et la grammatica di C. Crispo Sallustio. Savona, 1900. Henri Bornecque analyzes the work and commends it, but thinks it might be advantageously compressed a little. 22) W. C. Summers. C. Sallusti Crispi Catilina. Cambridge, 1900. Mentioned by Henri Bornecque. "C'est surtout une édition de vulgarisation"—and a rather poor one. 23) L. Lévy, Quo modo Tiberius Claudius Nero erga senatum se gesserit. Paris, 1901. A. Jardé states the conclusions reached, and, admitting the care and penetration of the author, raises and discusses several objections.

10. Pp. 283–4. List of books received.

No. 4.

1. Pp. 285–8. On a new edict of the emperor Julian, by H. Dessau. The edict is found in the publications of the Graeco-

Roman section of the Egypt Exploration Fund, No. XX, p.
116 f. Hitherto it has been ascribed to Severus Alexander; but
Dessau replies to the objections raised against Julian as the author,
and produces convincing arguments in his favor.

2. Pp. 289–94. On the Manuscripts of Thucydides, by H.
Stuart Jones. A reply to, or criticism of, the article of Daniel
Serruys. (See above, No. 3, art. 7).

3. Pp. 295–310. Critical notes on twenty–seven passages
of Ter. Phormio by Louis Havet. (Continuation from pp. 94 ff.,
pp. 225 ff.) These notes, which thus far extend to v. 664, are
indispensable for students, especially editors, of the Phormio.

4. Pp. 311–12. In Ter. Haut. 69 Theophanes Kakridis
defends the full stop at the end of the verse (*after* denique).

5. Pp. 313–19. Orphica Fr. 221, 227, 228, 254 (Abel) ably
discussed by Paul Tannery.

6. Pp. 320–36. Language and style of Victor of Vita, by F.
Ferrère. Second article (see above, No. 2, art. 7). These
interesting articles cannot be epitomized intelligibly.

7. Pp. 336–8. Note on an inscription of Troezen, by B.
Haussoullier. The inscription had been edited and annoted by
its finder, Ph. E. Legrand. H. discusses the part of it that
relates to the restoration of reprisals.

8. P. 338. B. H. publishes a note on the Milesian Lichas, son
of Hermophantos.

9. Pp. 339–45. Book Notices. 1) Euripidis Fabulae. Edi-
derunt R. Prinz et N. Wecklein. Lipsiae, 1899. E. Chambry
praises this work very highly, and suggests some slight improve-
ments. 2) Euripides. Hippolytos con introduzione commento
ed appendice critica di Augusto Balsamo. Parte prima (testo
critico e commento). Firenze, 1899. E. Chambry commends
the commentary, but awaits the publication of the critical ap-
pendix before criticizing the text. 3) K. Kalbfleisch.—Papyri
Argentoratenses. Progr. Univ. Rostock, 1901. Briefly described
by Paul Graindor. 4) Hermann Peter, Der Brief in der römischen
Litteratur. Abhandlungen der philolog.-hist. Klasse der königl.
Sächsch. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Band XX, No. 3.
Leipzig, 1901. A. Judé finds this work very valuable, but regrets
some faults. 5) F. Beck, Untersuchungen zu den Handschriften
Lucans (Diss. inaug., Munich). Munich 1900. A. Cartault ana-
lyzes this work at some length, recognizing its merits, but not
agreeing with the author on all points. 6) Richard Hildebrandt,
Beiträge zur Erklärung des Gedichtes Aetna. Leipzig, 1900.
Commended by A. Cartault, who does not however, approve
every detail.

10. Pp. 346–8. List of books received.

The Revue des Revues, begun in No. 2, is completed in this
number.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

BRIEF MENTION.

I have a certain sympathy with DITTMAR, as I tried to show in my too brief mention of his *Studien zur lateinischen Modus-lehre* (A. J. P. XX 113). The emotional side of the moods has not been sufficiently emphasized and so far I am in accord with him, but the emotions cool in passing through the medium of speech, if we dare not use λόγος of the early time. Pure emotion is inarticulate and does not fall within the sphere of language proper. It is well enough to imagine the indicative as a pool of Bethesda, which is moved by the spirit of strife into subjunctive, subjective and polemic ripples, but how are we to measure the ripples? Surely Herr DITTMAR takes himself too seriously when in one of his recent outgivings he says: Der Konjunktiv <weist> auf die seelische Depression des Sprechers hin, der Acc. c. inf. auf die seelische Extase, der Indikativ auf die seelische Ataraxie. Diese drei Modi stehen im engsten Zusammenhang mit der Wirklichkeit und der realen Welt der Dinge. Ihnen steht gegenüber der Optativ welcher uns aus der Welt des Seins in die des Scheins, aus dem Reiche der Realität in das Gebiet der die Fesseln des Raumes und der Zeit, der Kausalität und Realität sprengenden Phantasie führt. Damit ist ein fester Boden gegeben auf dem weiter gebaut werden kann (Berliner Phil. Woch. 22 März 1902). 'Fester Boden' seems to me a strange term for the troubled sea of emotion; and, what is more, the psychic state of the speaker will not help us to reproduce the phenomena. The ἀταραξία of the utterance does not necessarily reflect the ἀταραξία of the utterer. The indicative in certain constructions produces the undeniable effect of grimness and grimness is a false ἀταραξία. Nothing can be more illuminating than a survey of the constructions of the verbs of emotion, constructions which show the reciprocal play of heart and brain, but these are things that are not to be mastered by the simple process of phrase-making. He who wishes to see the beauty of the Queen we call Language must stand where Gyges stood and gaze as Gyges gazed.

Apart then from the eloquence there seems to be little new in the practical outcome of DITTMAR's programme. Other grammarians have called the indicative the mood of quiet assertion; the dubitative subjunctive, the subjunctive of fear and dread, of apprehension and embarrassment, is not a stranger, even if we have not learned to call it the mood of depression; and the optative

mood is still the ideal mood, the mood of the fancy. The accusative with the infinitive is nothing but the object effected, the thing generated, and like all generation demands the forthputting of energy, ecstatic energy, if one chooses. No one who has served an apprenticeship on a political newspaper as a flyer of editorial kites, as a manufacturer of nicknames, will be much impressed by the interminable terminology that is invading the grammatical domain; and I am disposed to do penance for my humble part in enlarging that nomenclature. There are hosts of phrases that might be used with some color of propriety. Why not call the indicative the mood of sapience? Sapience involves ἀταραξία. Why not call the unreal indicative the mood of resipiscence to match the imperfect of expergefaction, the imperfect with ἄρα? Or we might call the optative the mood of illusion and then the unreal indicative would fitly be the mood of disillusion. Why not? But I forbear. In a recent number of the Journal I made light of the abomination of desolation spoken of by Benjamin, the prophet (A. J. P. XXIII 1, note), but I must confess that I too am beginning to dread lest we grammarians become 'chimaerae bombinantes in vacuo' and that vacuum the classroom; I too am beginning to dread lest what the late epigram says of the rhetorician prove true of the grammarian:

> Χαίρετ᾽, Ἀριστείδου τοῦ ῥήτορος ἑπτὰ μαθηταί,
> τέσσαρες οἱ τοῖχοι καὶ τρία συψέλια

which some rhymester, emulous of Mrs. Browning's consonances, has imitated thus:

> I'm a success, sir, I'm a success, sir,
> Seven steady students are at each lecture,
> Four walls and three desks, sir.

———

Il. 19, 92–3 we read:

> τῇ μέν θ᾽ ἁπαλοὶ πόδες, οὐ γὰρ ἐπ᾽ οὔδει
> πίλναται, ἀλλ᾽ ἄρα ἥ γε κατ᾽ ἀνδρῶν κράατα βαίνει.

In Plato's Symposium 195 D Agathon presents the following variants. For τῇ (Aristarchos) he has τῆς, and for ἐπ᾽ οὔδει he has ἐπ᾽ οὔδεος and, as Stobaeus in quoting Plato (Floril. LXIII 36) quotes τῆς and οὔδεος, we may well acquiesce in the Platonic text. Now superstition about the authority of quotations as against the received text has long been exploded. Everything depends on the quoter. A pedantic grammarian who believed in verifying references might be considered seriously; but the healthy ancient like the healthy modern quoted from memory and memory is tricky. Every now and then some newspaper article sets the masses right, but on they go again using French that is anything but French, misquoting Shakespeare and the Bible, chief of all,

murdering the author of Hudibras, twisting Pope. An amusing list of inexactitudes in the way of quotation may be found in Ezra Abbot's Authorship of the Fourth Gospel; and Dean Farrar's singularly comprehensive and singularly inaccurate memory was shown up by Mr. Jeans in the Classical Review V (1891) 279. As for the specimen on hand I cannot agree with Professor HOWES (Harvard Studies VI 201), in thinking that 'Plato may well be preserving an old tradition in the form οὔδεος'. There is absolutely no warrant for οὔδεος. As for τῆς, which according to Professor HOWES has only the authority of the scholion Ven. A, and we might add the Genevese scholion, Ludwich says that most of the MSS of Homer have τῆς, the smaller number τῇ with Aristarchos.

———

Now we all know Plato's naughty ways with poetry, how prone he is to fit his poetical quotations to the body of his work by prose flanges, so to speak; how he turns the order topsy-turvy to the befoolment of such amateurs as Mr. Pater (A. J. P. XV 93), how he plays with the diction of the original, 'like a sunbeam that has lost its way on an old wall', to quote M. Taine's pretty words about Shakespeare. In the passage before us the epic vocabulary is kept, but it looks to me very much as if Plato had put the preferentially prose syntax for the preferentially poetic syntax. In prose, parts of the body as parts of the body, take the genitive, and when the grammarian Lesbonax wished to present an extravagant form of the σχῆμα Κολοφώνιον, he manufactured ἡ κεφαλὴ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ which corresponds to the negro French 'tête à l'homme', and the example is certainly deterrent (A. J. P. XXIII 22). How steady the use is, it may be well to bring to the consciousness, especially as it is distinctly partitive. The dative gives a different turn. See my note on Pind. O. 6, 5. On these diamonds of speech pivot the wheels of poetry. How many generations of men repeated 'facilis descensus Averni'. Who would put 'Averni' back now instead of the semipersonalizing dative? 'Hell from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming'. And finally, as between ἐπί with the dative and ἐπί with the genitive, the dative is more poetic (A. J. P. XVIII 119), and so we find in Δ 443: ἐπὶ χθονὶ βαίνει.

———

In the preface to his annotated edition of *Homer's Odyssey*, Books XIII–XXIV (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press), Mr. MONRO says that the volume is designed as a continuation of the commentary on the Odyssey begun more than twenty-five years ago by Dr. RIDDELL and completed by Dr. MERRY. The second edition of the Riddell-Merry book appeared in 1885 and after another long interval during which Homeric studies have not

16

stood still, the Riddell-Merry-Monro τρικάρανος 'Οδύσσεια is there with its twenty-four books. To form a just judgment of Mr. MONRO's continuation, it would be necessary to study the limitations of the task, to examine how far the work of Mr. MONRO's predecessors has anticipated him or haply has hampered him, but we are only too glad to welcome any contribution that so eminent an Homeric scholar, as Mr. MONRO is, chooses to make to our stock of knowledge. The truth about the edition, as about so many editions by specialists, is that the editor does not condescend to men of low estate and that the points that he touches are only such as interest himself. Of course, in a work addressed to scholars, not schoolboys, we do not expect trivialities, but Homeric research has been so active that only Homeric specialists can hope to be perfectly up-to-date; and what Mr. MONRO gives us in his notes deals largely with his present views of moot points. References to the editor's admirable Homeric Grammar form the stock of his grammatical explanations and therefore there is little new in that line. When a professed grammarian writes a commentary, he is naturally more alive to all the phenomena that he has registered in his grammar than the ordinary editor would be, and the observations already made are apt to absorb his attention. Of especial interest are the appended essays, which have to do with such important problems as the Composition of the Odyssey, the Relation of the Odyssey to the Iliad, Homer and the Cyclic Poets—a favorite domain of Mr. MONRO's—the Time and Place of Homer and the Homeric House. As I have said before, the delight of being an Homeric scholar has the terrible drawback of the necessity of taking up a definite position on these much debated questions. No sooner do we yield to Reichel than we are roused from our supineness by Robert, and no sooner do we rebuild the palace of Odysseus than the latest news from Knossos makes us reconsider our plans. That Mr. MONRO has gone into the mellay of Homeric controversy reluctantly is fairly evident from his preface, and we are all the more grateful to him for his clear and succinct account of modern research, because we appreciate the sacrifice he has made.

One day I was making my moan to my old fellow-student, Professor WHITNEY, about my hopeless quest of typographical impeccability. The higher the standard, the flatter the failure. But small comfort did I receive from that careful scholar, who professed that he himself had withstood all the assaults of the printer's devil, that adversary of the philological soul, on whom the philological soul often unloads more than is his due. I listened and waited and not in vain. A few months after our talk, the printer had found the heel of the invulnerable Achilles. A leaf had lighted on the back of 'der gehörnte Siegfried' of philology.

The types had put 'older' for 'other' and made inerrant
WHITNEY responsible for a sad heresy (see A. J. P. XIV 138).
For my own part, nothing reconciles me to a typographical error.
I admire but I cannot emulate the temper of the fine old Athenian
gentlemen described by Aristophanes,

εἰ δέ που πέσοιεν ἐς τὸν ὦμον ἐν μάχῃ τινί,
τοῦτ᾽ ἀπεψήσαντ᾽ ἄν, εἶτ᾽ ἠρνοῦντο μὴ πεπτωκέναι,

and find myself intoning the tragic lament:

χωρεῖ πρὸς ἧπαρ γενναία δύη.

—

From this preamble it will readily be divined that I am in
trouble again. Not only does the last number of the Journal show
here and there typographical slips of an elementary sort, which
the benevolent reader will correct without further ado and
the malevolent reader will point at with scorn, but I find myself
committed to a sentence which is exactly the reverse of what
I intended to write, a blunder which is mine alone. On p. 108
l. 22 from bottom read 'I should not proceed to reverse the
old tenet which represents the genitive as *dependent on the
nominal element of the verb rather than on the verbal element
of the noun*'. Compare the foot-note of the same number, p. 22.
As I have already said, the early relations of Indo-Germanic
lie beyond the range of my speculations. All that I try to make
out is the Greek conception. Paul says that adnominal and
adverbal genitive have distinct functions in Indo-Germanic,
a fortiori in Greek. Are they parallel in the Greek mind, or
which is subordinate to which? To me it does not seem that the
predominance of the adnominal genitive has been overthrown,
and I am interested to see that Delbrück's contention that the
adverbal genitive was the older is not yielded by the latest
investigator VAN WIJK, who, by the way, following the lead
of STREITBERG, maintains in a dissertation just published at
Zwolle, *Der nominale Genetiv Singular im Indogermanischen,*
that the genitive singular in Indo-Germanic is originally identical
with the nominative, σκωπός, for instance, differing in the last
analysis from σκώψ (*skép-es) only in the matter of accent.
This view helps us to understand the adnominal genitive, the
function of which is to form temporary compounds with the
noun, but VAN WIJK's explanation of the adverbal genitive on
the same basis seems to halt. But of this more hereafter.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 812 Broadway, New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Andrew (S. O.) Greek prose composition. New York, *Macmillan*, 1902. 10+275 pp. 12mo, net, 90 c.

Babbitt (F. C.) A grammar of Attic and Ionic Greek. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1902. 448 pp. 12mo, cl., $1.50.

Barnum (Francis). Grammatical fundamentals of the Innuit language, Boston, *Ginn*, 1901. c. 25+384 pp. 8vo, cl., $5.

Cicero (M. T.) Select orations and letters; rev. by J. B. Greenough and G. L. Kittredge, with a special vocabulary. Boston, *Ginn*, 1902. 50+226 pp. 12mo, hf. leath., $1.45.

Gildersleeve (B. L.) Studies in honor of. Baltimore, *Johns Hopkins Press*, 1902. 517 pp. por. 8vo, cl., $6.

Gray (L. H.) Indo-Iranian phonology. New York, *Macmillan*, 1902. 17+264 pp. 8vo, (Columbia Univ. and Indo-Iranian ser., v. 2.) cl., net, $3.

Justianus. The pandects of Justinian; tr. into English by W. Maude. In 4 v., v. 1. New York, *Cambridge Encylopaedia Co.*, 1902. 500 pp. 8vo, cl., $5.

Lucian. Lucius, the ass; with notices by P. L. Courier and A. J. Pons; il. by M. Poirson. Printed for subscribers only by *G. Barrie & Son*, 1902. 36+322 pp. il. (partly col.) 12mo, (Antique gems from the Greek and Latin, v. 5.) (Apply to pubs. for price.)

Ovid. Amorum libri tres, picturis illustrati. Published only for subscribers by *G. Barrie & Son*, 1902. 33+517 pp. il. (partly col.) 12mo, (Antique gems from the Greek and Latin, v. 6.) cl. (Apply to pubs. for price).

Plato. Euthyphro; with introd. and notes by W. A. Heidel. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1902. 115 pp. 12mo, cl., $1.

West (A. F.) A Latin grammar for schools. New York, *Appleton*, 1902. 11+262 pp. 12mo, (Twentieth century text-books.) cl., net, 90 c.

ENGLISH.

Homeri Opera. Ed. by D. B. Monro and T. W. Allen. 2 vols. London 1902. 8vo, 5s. 6d.

Plato. Res publica. Ed. by J. Burnet. London, 1902. 8vo, 6s.

Ritchie (D. G.) Plato. Edinburgh, 1902. 8vo, 240 pp. 3s.

GERMAN.

Appel (Carl). Provenzalische Chrestomathie m. Abriss der Formenlehre u. Glossar. 2., verb. Aufl. (XLI, 344 S.) gr. 8. Leipzig, 1902, *O. R. Reisland*. m. 9.

Bibliotheca philologica classica. Appendix ad annales de studiorum quae ad scientiam antiquarum rerum pertinent progressibus. Vol. XXIX. 1902. 4 Hfte. (1. Hft. II 62 S.) gr. 8. Leipzig, *O. R. Reisland*. Subskr.-Pr. m. 7.

Corpus inscriptionum etruscarum. In societatem operis adsumpto Olavo Aug. Danielsson ed. Carol. Pauli. Segmentum 9 et 10. (1. Bd. XI u. S. 554-644.) Fol. Leipzig, 1901-02, *J. A. Barth*. m. 26.

Corpus inscriptionum latinarum consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum borussicae editum. Vol. III. Inscriptionum Orientis et Illyrici latinarum supplementum, edd. Thdr. Mommsen, Otto Hirschfeld, Alfr. Domaszewski. Pars posterior. Adiectae sunt tabulae geographicae decem. (XXVI–LXXXIII, S. 35–48, 2039–2724, 2316^1–2316^{86} u. 2328^1–2328^{904}.) Fol. Berlin, *G. Reimer.* 1902. m. 114.

Donati (Aeli), quod fertur commentum Terenti. Accedunt Eugraphi commentum et scholia Bembina. Recens. Paul. Wessner. Vol. I. (L, 542 S.) 8. Leipzig, 1902, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 10.

Euripides. Fabulae, edd. R. Prinz et N. Wecklein. Vol. III, pars 6. Rhesus, ed. N. Wecklein. (V, 101 S.) gr. 8. Leipzig, 1902, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 3.60.

Festschrift, Theodor Gomperz dargebracht zum 70. Geburtstage am 29. III. 1902 v. Schülern, Freunden, Collegen. (IV, 499 S. m. 1 Bildnis.) Lex. 8vo. Wien, 1902, *A. Hölder.* m. 12.

Georgii (Heinr.) Die antike Vergilkritik in den Bukolika u. Georgika. [Aus: "Philologus, Ergänzgsbd."] (S. 209–328.) gr. 8. Leipzig, 1902, *Dieterich.* m. 3.60.

Grammatici graeci recogniti et apparatu critico instructi. Vol. I, fasc. II. gr. 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* I, 2. Apollonii Dyscoli quae supersunt. Recensuerunt Rich. Schneider et Gust. Uhlig. Vol. I, fasc. II. Rich. Schneideri commentarium criticum et exegeticum in Apollonii scripta minora continens. (III, 274 S.) 1902. m. 16.

Harris (M. Anstice). A glossary of the Old English gospels, Latin-Old-English, Old-English-Latin. (III, 111 S.) gr. 8. Leipzig, 1902, *Buchh. G. Fock.* m. 6.

Heine (Margar.) Substantiva m. *a* privativum. Diss. (52 S.) gr. 8. München, 1902, *A. Buchholz.* m. 1.50.

Herwerden (Henr. van). Lexicon graecum suppletorium et dialecticum. (X, 973 S.) gr. 8. Leiden, 1902, *A. W. Sijthoff.* m. 28.

Hippocratis opera quae feruntur omnia. Vol. II. Ex codicibus italicis ed. Hugo Kuehlewein. (XVI, 279 S.) 8. Leipzig, 1902, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 5.

Homeri carmina. Recens. et selecta lectionis varietate instruxit Arth. Ludwich. Pars I. Ilias. Vol. I. (XIX, 514 S.) gr. 8. Leipzig, 1902, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 16.

Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini graecae et latinae. Ed. Basil. Latyschev. Vol. IV. Supplementa continens per annos 1885–1900 collecta. (X, 358 S. m. Abbildgn. u. 1 Taf.) Imp. 4to. Petropoli, 1901. (Leipzig, *Voss' Sort.*) m. 30.

Jüthner (Jul.) Der Gymnastikos des Philostratos. Eine textgeschichtl. u. textkrit. Untersuchg. [Aus: "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] (79 S. m. 3 Taf.) gr. 8. Wien, 1902, *C. Gerold's Sohn in Komm.* m. 2.80.

Meyer (Leo). Handbuch der griechischen Etymologie. 4. (Schluss-)Bd. Wörter m. dem Anlaut σ, ν, μ, ρ, λ. (608 S.) 8. Leipzig, 1902, *S. Hirzel.* m. 14.

Michael (Hugo). Das homerische u. das heutige Ithaca. Progr. (28 S. m. 1 Karte.) 4to. Jauer, 1902, *O. Hellmann.* m. 1.50.

Middendorff (Heinr.) Altenglisches Flurnamenbuch. (156 S.) gr. 8. Halle, 1902, *M. Niemeyer.* m. 3.

Muss-Arnolt (W.)   Assyrisch-englisch-deutsches Handwrtrb.   12. Lfg.
Berlin, *Reuther & R.* m. 5.

Mythographi graeci. Vol. III, fasc. II. 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* III,
2. Palaephati περὶ ἀπίστων. Heracliti qui fertur libellus περὶ ἀπίστων.
Excerpta Vaticana (vulgo Anonymus de incredibilibus). Ed. Nic. Festa.
(LIII, 128 S.) 1902. m. 2.80.

Nilos Doxapatres. Τάξις τῶν πατριαρχικῶν θρόνων, armen. u. griech. hrsg,
v. Frz. Nikol. Finck. (IV, 46 S.) 4. Marburg, 1902, *N. G. Elwert's Verl.*
m. 2.50.

Papyri graecae musei Britannici et musei Berolinensis ed. a Carolo Kalb-
fleisch. Progr. (14 S. m. 2 Lichtdr.-Taf.) gr. 4.   Rostock, 1902, *H.
Warkentien.* m. 2.

Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt, edd. Leop. Cohn et Paul.
Wendland. (Ed. maior.) Vol. IV. Ed. C. (XXXIV, 307 S.) 8. Berlin
1902, *G. Reimer.* m. 10.

—— Ed. minor. Vol. IV. Recognovit C. (XIII, 254 S.) 8. Berlin,
1902, *G. Reimer.* m. 2.

Philostrati minoris imagines et Callistrati descriptiones. Recens. C. Schenkl
et Aemil. Reisch. (LVIII, 82 S.) 8. Leipzig, 1902, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 2.40.

Praetorius (Frz.) Ein Nachwort zu meiner Schrift üb. die Herkunft der
hebr. Accente. (22 S.) 8. Berlin, 1902, *Reuther & Reichard.* m. 1.50.

Remigii Autissiodorensis in artem Donati minorem commentum. Ed. W.
Fox, S. I. (XII, 100 S.) 8. Leipzig, 1902, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 1.80.

Schmidt (Carol.) De arte rhetorica in Musonii diatribis conspicua. Diss.
(78 S.) 8. Friburgi Brisig. 1902. Leipzig, *Buchh. G. Fock.* m. 1.50.

Staedler (Karl). Die Horazfrage seit Lessing. Progr. (18 S.) 4. Berlin,
1902, *R. Gaertner.* m. 1.

Thesaurus linguae latinae. Editus auctoritate et consilio academiarum
quinque germanicarum Berolinensis, Gottingensis, Lipsiensis, Monacensis,
Vindobonensis. Vol. I, fasc. 4 et vol. II, fasc. 3. (Sp. 705–944 u. 481–720.)
Imp. 4. Leipzig, 1902, *B. G. Teubner.* Subskr.-Pr., m. 7.20 each.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (Ulr. v.) Griechisches Lesebuch. I. Text. 2
Bde. 2., unveränd. Abdr. gr. 8. Berlin, 1902, *Weidmann.* Cloth, 5.40.

—— Griechisches Lesebuch. II. Erläuterungen. 2. Bde. 2., unveränd.
Abdr. gr. 8. Berlin, 1902, Weidmann. 1. (IV u. S. 1–126)—2. (IV u. S.
127–270). Cloth, each m. 2.

Zetterstéen (K. V.) Beiträge zur Kenntnis der religiösen Dichtung Balai's.
(IV 52 u. 56 S.) 4. Leipzig, 1902, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 12.

ITALIAN.

Cocchia (Enrico). Saggi filologici. Vol. II: Studî sulla letteratura latina
arcaica. Napoli. 8vo, p. 440 e 1 tav. L. 3.

—— Saggi filologici. Vol. III. L'Italia meridionale e la Campania nella
tradizione classica. Napoli. 16mo, p. 436 e 9 tav. L. 3.

Finzi (Giuseppe). Dizionario di citazioni latine. Palermo-Milano. 8vo,
p. 981. L. 8.

Platone. Dialoghi tradotti da Ruggero Bonghi. Vol. X: Il Fedro o della
Bellezza; Alcibiade I o dell'Uomo; Carmide o della Temperanza. Torino.
16mo, p. 248. L. 4.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Ἀθηνᾶ. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἐπιστημονικῆς Ἐταιρείας. Τόμος ιδ' Τεῦχος ά καὶ β'. Ἀθήνησι. 1902.

Barss (J. E.) Writing Latin. Book One. Second Year Work. (Gilder-sleeve-Lodge Latin Series.) New York, *University Publishing Co.*, 1902.

Ball (F. K.) The Elements of Greek. New York, *The Macmillan Co.* $1.

Beiträge zur alten Geschichte. Herausg. v. C. F. Lehmann. Band II, Heft. 1. Leipzig, *Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1902.

Bevan (Edwyn Robert). The Prometheus Bound by Aeschylus, rendered into English Verse. London, *David Nutt*, 1902. 5s.

Carnoy (A.) Le Latin d'Espagne d'après les inscriptions. 1ᵉ Partie: Vocalisme. Louvain, *J.-B. Istas*, 1902.

Clement (W. K.) The Latin Prohibitive and Prof. Elmer. (Reprint fr. Class. R., April, 1902.)

De Reul (Paul). Du point de vue sociologique dans l'histoire du langage. (Extrait de la Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles, Janvier-Février, 1902.)

Delbrück (B.) Die Grundbegriffe der Kasus u. Modi. Mit Beziehung auf Morris, Prinzipien der lateinischen Syntax. (Sonderabdruck aus den Neuen Jahrbüchern, Jahrg. 1902. 1 Abt. IX. Band.)

Duerden (J. E.) Report of the Actinians of Porto Rico (U. S. Commission of Fish and Fisheries). Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1902.

Griechische u. lateinische Schriftsteller mit Anmerkungen.

Ciceros Rede über den Oberbefehl des Pompeius. Erkl. v. O. Drenck-hahn. 80 pf.

Ovid. Auswahl von Dr. Tegge. Erster Theil. Text u. Kommentar (Separat geb.) 1 m. 60 + 2 m. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*. 1902.

Hammond (Eleanor P.) On the Text of Chaucer's Parlement of Foules. University of Chicago, Decennial Publications (reprint). *University of Chicago Press*, Chicago, 1902.

Haupt u. Sauppesche Sammlung Griechischer u. lateinischer Schriftsteller.

Ausgewählte Reden des Demosthenes. Erkl. v. Anton Westermann. Erstes Bändchen, 10te verb. Aufl., bes. von Emil Rosenberg. 2 m. 20 pf.

Herodotos. Erkl. v. Heinrich Stein. Erster Bd. Zweites Heft. Buch II. 5 verb. Aufl. 2 m. 20 pf.

Vergil's Gedichte. Erkl. von Th. Ladewig u. C. Schaper Zweites Bänd-chen. Buch I–VI der Aeneis. 12te Aufl. Bearb. von Paul Deuticke. 2 m. 40. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1902.

Hermes. Zeitschrift für Classische Philologie. Herausg. v. F. Leo u. Carl Robert. XXXVII. Band. 2. Heft. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1902.

Howard (J. H.) Case Usage in Petronius' Satires. Leland Stanford University Thesis, 1899.

Jenkyns (Sir Henry).   British Rule and Jurisdiction beyond the Seas.   With a Preface by Sir Courtenay Ilbert.   Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press.*   New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1902.   15s.

Kalbfleisch (Carolus).   Papyri Graecae Musei Britannici et Musei Berolinensis.   (Ind. Lect. Rostoch).   Rostock, *Warkentien*, 1902.

Kern (Otto).   Ueber die Anfänge der hellenischen Religion.   Vortrag. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1902.   80 pf.

Lambert (Édouard).   La Question de l'authenticité des XII Tables et des Annales Maximi.   (Extrait de la *Nouvelle Revue historique de Droit français et étranger*, Mars-Avril, 1902.)

Long (Chas. M.)   Indicative Apodoses with Subjunctive Protases in the Unreal Conditional Sentences of Livy and Tacitus.   (U. of Va. Diss.)   1901.

Magnússon (Eiríkr).   A Fragment of the Old Danish Version of the Legend of St. Christina in Collotype Facsimile.   Trans. Cambr. Phil. Soc.   V, Part III. London, *C. J. Clay*, 1902.   2s.

Merriman (Roger Bigelow).   Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell.   In two volumes.   Vol. I: Life and Letters to 1585.   Vol. II: Letters from 1536. Notes.   Index.   Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press.*   New York, *Henry Frowde.* 1902.   18s.

Nissen (Heinrich).   Italische Landeskunde.   Zweiter Band.   Die Städte. Erste Hälfte.   Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1902.   7 m.

Oman (Charles).   A History of the Peninsular War.   Vol. I, 1807–1809. From the Treaty of Fontainebleau to the Battle of Corunna.   With Maps, Plans and Portraits.   Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press.*   New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1902.   14s.

Schlicher (J. J.)   The Psychological Background of Indirect Discourse School Review.   Vol. X, No. 5.   May, 1902.

Weil (Henri).   Xénophon et l'avenir du monde grec (Sonderabdruck aus der Festschrift für Theodr. Gomperz).   Wien, *Alfred Hölder*, 1902.

West (A. F.)   A Latin Grammar for Schools.   (Twentieth century textbooks.)   New York, *D. Appleton & Co.*, 1902.

Van Wijk (N.)   Der nominale Genetiv singular im Indogermanischen in seinem Verhältnis zum Nominativ.   Zwolle, *Tijl*, 1902.

Vendryes (J.)   Recherches sur l'histoire et les effets de l'intensité initiale en Latin.   Paris, *Klincksieck*, 1902.   8 fr.

Zeitschrift für französischen u. englischen Unterricht.   Herausg. v. M. Kaluza, E. Koschwitz, G. Thurau.   1 Band.   1 Heft.   Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1902.